THE ROLE OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION IN FEDERAL POSITION EVALUATION
CIA RELATIONSHIP TO THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this lecture is to discuss the role of the Civil Service Commission in Federal position evaluation and the CIA's relationship to the Civil Service Commission. Included first is an explanation of CSC role under the Classification Act of 1923; second the CSC function at the present time under the Classification Act of 1949; and finally the manner in which the CIA position evaluation program operates.

II. CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923

A. Compensation Schedules

The Classification Act of 1923 established five different schedules of compensation, namely:

1. Custodial (changed to CPC in August, 1942)

   The Custodial Service included positions involving performance of supervision of work in the custody, maintenance, and protection of public buildings, premises, and equipment; the transportation of public officers, employees or property; and the transmission of official papers. Falling into this schedule were such positions as messengers, building guards, laborers, charwomen, elevator operators, etc.

2. Clerical, Administrative, and Fiscal (CAF)

   The CAF Service included positions involving the performance or supervision of clerical, administrative, or accounting work, or any other work commonly associated with office, business, or fiscal administration. Falling into this schedule were such positions as personnel officers, fiscal accountants, mail and file clerks, supply officers, secretaries, typists, stenographers, and clerks.

3. Professional and Scientific (P)

   The Professional and Scientific Service included positions involving the performance or supervision of routine, advisory, administrative, or research work based upon the established principles of a profession or science and requiring professional, scientific, or technical training equivalent to that represented by graduation from a college or university of recognized standing. Falling into this schedule were such positions as chemists, engineers, and economists.

4. Subprofessional (SP)

The Subprofessional Service included positions involving the performance or supervision of work incident, subordinate, or preparatory to the work required of employees holding positions in the professional and scientific service, which required or involved professional, scientific, or technical training of any degree inferior to that represented by graduation from a college or university of recognized standing. Falling into this schedule were such positions as laboratory technicians, library assistants, medical technicians.

5. Clerical-Mechanical (CM)

The Clerical-Mechanical Service included positions not in a recognized trade or craft, located in the Government Printing Office, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the Mail Equipment Shop, involving the performance or direction of manual or machine operations requiring special skill or experience or the counting, examining, sorting, or other verification of the product of manual or machine operations.

It was the intent of the Classification Act of 1923 to insure that employees received "equal pay for equal work." In order to accomplish this, grade levels were established within each of the above schedules as follows:

Schedule	Grade Range	Per Annum Rates
1. Custodial (Later CPC)	1 through 10	$600 to $3000
2. Clerical, Administrative, and Fiscal (CAF)	1 through 15	$1140 to $8000
3. Professional and Scientific (P)	1 through 8	$1860 to $8000
4. Subprofessional (SP)	1 through 8	$900 to $3000
5. Clerical-Mechanical (CM)	1 through 5	45 to 50¢ per hour to $3600

In order to establish a workable system of proper schedules, grades and salaries for positions, Congress endeavored to define the activities as well as the general level of responsibilities for the various grade levels within each schedule. In addition, Congress established the pay rates for each grade, which can be changed only by an Act of Congress. The Civil Service Commission has no responsibility for establishing pay rates.

B. Responsibilities of Departments and Agencies for Administering a Classification Program

Under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, Federal agencies were responsible for developing a classification program that would insure the adequate coverage of all positions in the departmental service of the agencies. This required the

development of organizational and functional charts, the establishment of classification files and the preparation of position descriptions covering all types of positions.

The preparation of position descriptions usually required desk audits on each position reviewed, including positions into which an employee was being promoted even though the higher grade had been previously established. Upon completion of the desk audit and the preparation of position descriptions, it was necessary that the descriptions and the agency recommendation concerning title, series, and grade be submitted to the Civil Service Commission for final allocation. In many instances agency representatives had to meet with CSC officials to discuss and justify any questionable information contained in position descriptions.

As you can see, establishment of positions was a time consuming process especially since CSC classifiers usually were assigned more than one agency. It became necessary for CSC to limit a representative's assignment to one agency in order to render more expeditious service in the establishment of positions. During the war years, however, the CSC didn't expand as much as the various government agencies so it couldn't handle all classification requests effectively. In view of this situation the CSC had to rely more upon the classification organizations of the agencies.

C. Responsibilities of the Civil Service Commission for Insuring the Adequacy and Effectiveness of Classification Programs in Government Organizations

As previously mentioned the Civil Service Commission was responsible for the final allocation of all positions in the departmental services of the Federal Government. In addition to the required review or pre-audit of position descriptions prior to allocation, the CSC was responsible for the development of classification standards covering all types of positions.

In the development of these standards the CSC representatives conducted studies of similar positions located throughout the Government. On the basis of this information they prepared detailed explanation of the various duties and responsibilities assigned to individuals in different organizations and endeavored to establish a grade pattern for the proper allocation of such positions. These standards served as guides for position classifiers throughout the Government in the analysis and evaluation of positions.

During the war years the limited size of the CSC standards staff precluded the development of a sufficient number of standards covering the different types of positions, especially those found in the emergency agencies. As a result many departments developed standards to cover their positions. Later many of these standards were accepted by the CSC and utilized after appropriate modifications.

D. Appeal Procedures

Agencies and employees had the right to appeal allocations recommended by the agencies or made by the Civil Service Commission. In this connection, it was necessary for the individual or the agency to develop detailed justification explaining why the decision was considered inappropriate. Such appeals were presented in writing to the CSC; and if necessary, there were conferences of agency and CSC representatives. In the end the decision of the CSC on appeal cases was considered final.

III. CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A. Delegation of Classification Authority to Agencies

The Classification Act of 1949 delegated to the departments and agencies of the Federal Government final allocating authority for all positions through GS-15. As the Government agencies expanded in size and number of programs the CSC budget did not allow for a proportionate expansion in its staffs. Perhaps this was an oversight on the part of Congress in approving appropriations; or, more probably, the result of the trend toward decentralization of personnel functions to the departments and agencies. In any case, it became necessary to delegate final classification authority to the departments and agencies, who were also given the responsibility for developing comprehensive classification programs and for determining the proper title, series, and grade for each position in the organization, headquarters and field.

Many arguments can be presented for the pros and cons of decentralization. Some of these are:

PROS

1. Final classification authority with the agency saves time and allows for the prompt handling of urgent classification matters.

2. Agency personnel are generally more familiar with the activities of the agency and the peculiar aspects of its positions; therefore, are better qualified to render accurate decisions on the allocation of positions.

CONS

1. More pressure can be exerted by operating personnel in an agency or department which normally would not have any influence on a decision made by the CSC.

2. Inconsistencies in the allocation of similar positions in different agencies may occur unless a central control is established. The post-audit review is not effective once major misallocations are made since too many organizational implications are involved.

3. In many instances agency personnel, being too close to the organization, cannot take an objective view of the situation.

B. CSC Responsibility for Insuring the Adequacy, Effectiveness, and Consistency of Classification Programs Throughout the Federal Government

Under the Classification Act of 1949, the CSC is responsible for insuring that classification programs throughout the Government service are properly organized. In order to insure the effectiveness of these programs the Commission utilized the following procedures:

1. Post-Audit

The CSC maintains the responsibility on a post-audit basis for insuring the proper documentation and allocation of positions. To accomplish this responsibility, the Commission makes periodic surveys of the various agencies to review their classification actions. When inaccuracies in the allocation of positions are detected, the Commission has the authority to direct that such misclassifications be corrected.

At the present time the post-audit program is not too effective. This is due again to the fact that the Commission is not adequately staffed to survey each position in every Government agency. What is accomplished is on the basis of a sampling of positions in a given organization within the agency.

2. Inspection Activities

In addition to post-audit surveys, the CSC has developed a personnel inspection program. This involves an inspection of all personnel activities of an agency including recruitment, placement, training, classification, and records and transactions. These inspections involve a review of such things as agency regulations and directives relating to personnel functions; organization, structure and personnel of the personnel office itself; and all personnel files and records. In addition, the inspection team visits with operating officials and employees in order to obtain information on the type of service received from the personnel staff. On the basis of these inspections, the CSC develops reports outlining necessary revisions in the personnel program. Follow-up inspections are performed to insure compliance with recommendations and directives.

3. Classification Standards

The CSC is responsible for the publication of classification standards for all types of positions in the Federal Government. Standards include titles, definitions of series, descriptions of the various activities of positions, and the knowledges and skills required. Standards also define the variations among the different grade levels of the position. It is estimated that classification standards published by the CSC cover approximately 85% of all positions under the Classification Act of 1949.

The development of adequate standards is a major problem of the CSC. Standards must be developed to cover similar positions located throughout the entire Federal Government, yet must be sufficiently flexible to be interpreted in application to positions with varying working conditions and with varying kinds of problems. The CSC standards receive a considerable amount of criticism to the effect that they do not cover peculiar situations or positions found in certain organizations.

In addition, due to the lack of funds and personnel, it has been impossible for CSC to maintain standards on a current basis. The CSC must rely upon other Government agencies to furnish information concerning the duties, responsibilities, and unusual situations relating to positions in their organization. The CSC continues to adopt standards developed by other agencies, such as the Veterans Administration, Navy Department, and Public Health Service.

4. Certification to Civil Service Commission

Public Law 253 (The Whitten Amendment) as revised by specific appropriation acts established another control over the personnel activities of Federal Agencies. This law requires that "From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary, (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than July 31 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and appropriations committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with

information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on June 30 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous June 30, and each annual and supplemental budget estimate shall include a statement comparing the average grade and salary provided for in each item of appropriation or fund allowance therein with similar figures reported for the two previous periods."

5. Revocation of Classification Authority

The Civil Service Commission has the authority to revoke the allocating authority of any organization covered under the Classification Act of 1949. The CSC may use this authority on the basis of its findings in surveys and inspections. If it is determined that in a certain organization the program is poorly organized and that a large number of positions have been misallocated, the Commission may direct that all positions in the organization receive pre-audit approval before becoming final. During 1951, for example, the CSC exercised this authority and withdrew final allocating authority from a number of emergency organizations, such as the National Production Authority, Economic Stabilization Administration, and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. In these instances CSC representatives were assigned to assist the agencies in the establishment and allocation of positions. Normally the CSC official reviewed and approved each position description before further action could be taken. In NPA, for example, two CSC representatives were physically located in the organization until its abolishment in 1953.

6. Requirements in the Allocation of Supervisory Positions

The Classification Act of 1949 established another control on the activities of Federal agencies in the allocation of supervisory positions. This control is emphasized by the statement contained in the Act stating, "No appropriated funds shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee who placed a supervisory position in a classification and grade solely on the basis of the size of group, section, bureau, or other organizational units, or the number of subordinates supervised." This does not mean, however that various problems which are derived from the supervision of a large number of employees cannot be considered in the allocation of positions. For example, an individual responsible for the supervision of a large number of employees usually becomes involved in such problems as planning, organization, training, promotion, reassignments, and morale.

C. Abolishment of CAF, P, and SP Schedules

The Classification Act of 1949 abolished the CAF, P, and SP compensation schedules and combined them into the General Schedule. The CPC schedule was continued until its abolishment

in 1955, when some of its positions went into the General Schedule and others were transferred to wage board plans. The General Schedule ranges in grade from GS-1, basic salary $2690 per year, to GS-18, basic salary $14,800 per year.

Federal agencies covered under the Classification Act of 1949 may establish positions through GS-15; but in the matter of supergrade positions (GS-16, 17 and 18) Public Law 94, Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, states that, "No position shall be placed in grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule except by action of, or after prior approval by, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners." A limitation has also been placed on the number of supergrade positions that can be established in Federal agencies covered by the Classification Act. This limitation is as follows:

Total number	- Not to exceed 1226
GS-17	- Not to exceed 329
GS-18	- Not to exceed 130

These limitations do not apply to CIA. Agency Regulation [redacted] established the policy that the Director will determine the number of supergrade positions to be utilized by the Agency. All employees promoted or assigned to these positions will hold rank and pay of such positions in temporary status for such time as the Director may determine.

IV. CLASSIFICATION APPEAL PROCEDURES

A. General Information

Classification appeals may be made by either an employee or a department and may be initiated on decisions on (a) whether or not a position is covered by the Classification Act or (b) about the class or grade of the position. An employee may appeal to the Commission whether the classification decision was made by his department or by the Commission; however, he may appeal under the Classification Act only if the action affects his current position. Filing an appeal does not necessarily stop a classification action taken by a department on its own motion. It cannot stop an action ordered or taken by the CSC.

Generally when classification action is taken to lower the grade of a position the employee is notified of such action and can submit his appeal within 30 days after receipt of the notice. If corrective action is taken later to raise the effective date will be retroactive to the date of the appealed action. If the grade is raised on appeal because of duties and responsibilities which were added to the position after the date of the adverse action, the raise in grade cannot be made retroactive.

Classification actions tied in with the reduction in rank or compensation of a veterans-preference eligible will be discussed a little later.

B. Internal Appeal Procedures

Departments and agencies generally prefer to handle appeal cases internally. On internal appeal cases, the employee submits his appeal in writing to the classification office of the agency or department outlining his reasons for not agreeing with the allocation of his position. Upon receipt of appeal cases the classification office usually assigns a position classifier to review the case and to conduct necessary desk audits and discussions with supervisory personnel. After these are completed, another detailed position description is usually developed and submitted to the employee and supervisory personnel for review and certification. Any comment submitted by these individuals are reviewed and necessary amendments made. Once agreement is reached on the content of the position description, the position classifier makes comparisons with similar positions in the organization and with appropriate Civil Service and agency classification standards and develops a detailed report with recommendations concerning the allocation of the position. Key officials of the classification office review this report prior to its submission to the employee, who may accept the decision of the agency or may go one step further and appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

C. External Appeal Procedures (to Civil Service Commission)

Departments or agencies may appeal classification action taken by the CSC on the basis of its post-audit responsibility. In making such appeals they must submit detailed information concerning the duties and responsibilities of the position in question, classification standards utilized, and comments on the CSC's decision. In some instances, representatives of the two agencies meet to discuss the pros and cons of the Commission's decision, but the decision of the Commission is final.

An appeal by an employee must be in writing and in duplicate containing such information as:

1. Employee's name and mailing address.
2. Location of official headquarters and exact location in the organizational structure of the unit in which he works.
3. Present title, grade and salary of his position and requested title, grade or other classification action.
4. Complete and accurate description of duties and responsibilities.
5. Reasons why he believes the position is erroneously classified or should be brought under or excluded from the Classification Act.
6. Statement of any conditions or classification standards known to him which affect the appeal.

Wherever possible the employee and his supervisor should agree on the description of duties and responsibilities performed. If they disagree, the supervisor should append a statement indicating the points and nature of such disagreement.

When a department transmits an employee's appeal to the Commission (the employee may personally appeal directly to the CSC), it should furnish:

1. Further identification of the position, if necessary, with information about the position's place in the organization.
2. A copy of the official position description and any supplementary information bearing on the position's duties and responsibilities.
3. Special personnel data about the incumbent needed in determining effective dates of action, etc.
4. The action the department recommends, with reasons.

The employee actually benefits by following the appeal procedures of the agency since he can appeal an agency's decision to the CSC. By going directly to the CSC the employee disregards the possibility that the agency will reverse its initial decision. Once the CSC rules on the case, the employee has no further appeal channels. The agency or department by the same token must abide by the Commission's decision.

If an appeal is denied by a CSC Regional Office or by the CSC Departmental Position Classification Division it may be appealed to the Commission's Board of Appeals and Review with fourteen (14) calendar days after receipt of the decision by the department or employee who appealed.

D. Veterans' Appeals

An appeal of a preference-eligible veteran from a reduction in rank (grade) may involve either the correctness of a classification decision or other matters pertinent to a determination of whether an injustice has been done to the appellant. In the latter category are such things as:

1. Discrimination, personal prejudice, or bias as an element in the reduction or classification.
2. Assignment of different duties and responsibilities or arbitrary removal of duties so that the position would have to be classified downward.
3. Transfer of individual to another position which was known, prior to transfer, to be slated for reduction in grade.
4. Classification action based on administrative action personal to the employee and not on the duties and responsibilities of the position.

Decisions made by the CSC can be appealed in the same manner as classification appeals by any Government employee. Preference-eligible veterans who are to be reduced in grade or rank as a result of CSC classification decisions shall be given at least thirty (30) days advance notice stating any and all reasons, specifically and in detail, for such proposed action.

V. CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE POSITION EVALUATION PROGRAM

A. Adherence to the Classification Act of 1949

The Classification Act of 1949 specifically excluded CIA from the provisions of the Act. Other agencies such as the Atomic Energy Commission and Tennessee Valley Authority were also excluded. Although the Agency is exempt from the Classification Act, Agency Regulation [redacted] establishes the policy that in the 25X1A
allocation of positions adherence to the provisions of this Act will be followed insofar as possible. Basic classification principles and compensation schedules are to be followed to assure that employees receive equality of compensation for work performance. The Agency endeavors to utilize CSC position classification and qualification standards in establishing the allocation of positions; however, many problems are encountered. For example, classification standards used by the Commission generally are developed on the basis of information obtained from old-line agencies not having the unique positions of CIA. Since considerable interpretation is required to apply such standards to situations encountered in CIA, limited use is made of them.

B. Position Evaluation Procedures

In conducting the position evaluation program within the Agency, these procedures are followed:

1. Table of Organization Review

Normally new T/O's or major revisions to existing T/O's are submitted to the Position Evaluation Division for review and approval. These T/O's include such information as organizational structure and proposed position title, series, grade and identifying number. Upon receipt of such proposals the position evaluation officer is responsible for making a detailed review of the proposal in terms of the present organizational structure as compared with the proposed structure. Where there are apparent inconsistencies or new positions to be established, operating officials are called into discussion to obtain as much information as possible concerning the duties and responsibilities of the positions in question. On the basis of this, decisions are made on the title, series and grades of the positions. A Table of Organization Change Authorization (Form 261) is then prepared for approval by Chief, Position Evaluation Division. An approved 261 is the final authority for making necessary revisions to the existing T/O.

2. Desk Audits

When time permits, individual desk audits are conducted if the title, series, and grade of the positions have been questioned by the Position Evaluation Division. Generally, these desk audits involve discussions with the individual assigned to the particular position concerning the details of the various duties and responsibilities. The position evaluation officer must review work that has been performed by the incumbent and ask any pertinent questions concerning the manner in which the position is supervised, the procedures followed by the incumbent, reports or other documents that are prepared, and the use to which such material is put. Consideration must also be given to such factors as supervision exercised over other employees, the mental demands and qualifications such as knowledges, abilities, skills, education and experience required. On the basis of these desk audits, detailed position descriptions are developed outlining the duties and responsibilities of the position and covering such other factors as scope and effect of work, supervision received and supervision exercised over others, qualification requirements and distinguishing features. The distinguishing features usually include a brief evaluation of the position, outlining the factors which distinguish it from lower and higher grade positions with similar functions.

3. Discussions with Supervisory Personnel

It may be necessary to discuss proposed positions with supervisory personnel when an entirely new position is being established and not yet encumbered, when the present incumbent has only recently occupied the position and therefore cannot give a complete explanation of the duties and responsibilities, when the position is in a field installation, or, finally, when the supervisor intends to delete or add new duties and responsibilities to existing positions. In such instances, the position evaluation officer must discuss in detail the duties and responsibilities assigned to or to be assigned to the proposed position. On the basis of this information a position description is developed and allocated.

4. Employee Prepared Position Descriptions

In many instances the operating component submits to the Position Evaluation Division a proposed position description along with the request to either establish a new position or re-allocate an existing position. The position evaluation officer reviews the information contained therein to determine if the information is sufficient to allocate the position or if more data is required to give a clear picture of the position. When there is sufficient information, it becomes the official description. If additional information is required, discussions, generally brief in nature, are held

with supervisory personnel and/or the individual assigned to the specific position. Upon receipt of this information the position description may be rewritten or the position evaluation officer's notes may be attached to outline additional considerations to justify the allocation.

5. Position Comparisons

One means used to determine the proper allocation of positions is to make comparisons with existing positions in the Agency. In judging the way in which one position compares with another, duties and responsibilities as well as other factors such as supervision, mental demands, scope and effect, and qualification requirements must be considered. Normally the decision made by the position evaluation officer determines the allocation of the position and established a pattern for subsequent allocations.

In instances where position descriptions are not available, it is necessary to compare the grade structure of one T/O with another T/O having similar positions. On the basis of this comparison and a knowledge of the organization, tentative grade levels of positions are set.

6. CIA and CSC Classification and Position Standards

In the allocation of positions it is necessary that CSC classification methods be used wherever possible. As previously mentioned, the CSC standards cover positions found in old-line, stable government organizations and not the unique situations found in CIA; therefore, judgment and discretion are required in their usage which at best is limited. In addition to the CSC standards the Position Evaluation Division has a program for the development of both classification and qualification standards covering various positions in the Agency. These take into consideration unusual working conditions, security implications and other situations typical of CIA. In addition the position standards developed by the Position Evaluation Division include the qualification requirements that must be met by individuals considered for the position.

7. Time Factor

The time element is generally a major problem in establishing and allocating positions in the Agency. In most agencies days or even weeks may be spent in developing and allocating position descriptions. This is not the case in CIA. Often complete T/O's are submitted to the Position Evaluation Division with a stipulation that they be reviewed, approved, and distributed within 24 to 48 hours. Some of these contain several hundred positions. In such situations the position evaluation officer must make decisions on the basis of his knowledge of the particular organization. Allocations are made subject to further review upon receipt of detailed job information.

8. Security Implications

Due to the sensitivity of the many activities conducted by the Agency it is important that the security aspects be considered in the preparation of position descriptions. Sometimes only general information can be included instead of detailed explanations of the duties and responsibilities of the position. Then the position evaluation officer must give consideration to information that is not specifically defined in the description. In other cases information is too sensitive to permit development of a description, and the judgment of the position evaluation officer is of extreme importance in determining the appropriate allocation of such positions.

9. Wide-Spread Field Installations

The fact that the Agency has field installations located throughout the world causes many problems in the allocation of field positions as there are no position evaluation officers located outside headquarters. Field positions are allocated on the basis of the organizational structure and position information supplied by either field stations or headquarters officials.

Position information received from field stations is often very brief and does not give a complete explanation of the duties and responsibilities assigned to the particular position. Additional information must be requested from headquarters officials or from the field through dispatches. As you can see considerable extra time and effort is expended this way. It so happens that in the past few years several qualified position evaluation officers have been assigned as personnel officers in the Far East Area. Although these individuals have no authority for the allocation of positions they have had a part in sending very good job information from that area, which allows for the expeditious processing of classification requests.

It has been found that job information furnished by headquarters personnel concerning field positions often does not adequately reflect the actual duties being performed. This is not to say that the headquarters personnel are intentionally misrepresenting facts, but it stands to reason that most headquarters officials could not have a complete understanding of the specific duties of each individual position in a field area.

Isolation of stations, unusual working conditions, and security implications are among other problems to be considered in the allocation of field positions.

10. Pressure from Operating Elements

The Position Evaluation Division is confronted from time to time with pressure from operating elements in the Agency. This pressure is actually exerted because of the urgency of a particular project and the need for an individual with unique qualifications rather than to obtain a particular grade for a position in order to promote an efficient employee. Certain considerations must be given to these factors in the allocation of positions.

11. Career Implications

The Position Evaluation Division has an important part in the determination of the career designations assigned to positions. The title of a position is determined by the duties and responsibilities which make up the description. The title and duties are also considered in the assignment of a career designation to the position. In turn this designation determines the Career Service Board that will have jurisdiction over the position, which will then be used by the Board for personnel assignments, reassignments, rotations, promotions, etc. If position evaluation action is taken to change the title of a position -- on the basis of a change in duties and responsibilities -- the career designation may also change. The position then goes under the jurisdiction of a different career board. This does not necessarily mean that the present incumbent's career designation must be changed. He may be retained by his present career board and eventually assigned to a position in line with his career designation. Nevertheless, the responsibility for filling the position with a qualified individual rests with another career board once the position has been transferred from one career service designation to another.

POSITION EVALUATION TECHNIQUES AND TOOLS IN FACT FINDING

I. INTRODUCTION

Facts are the heart of the position evaluation process. Without them, there is little use to try to establish and maintain a position evaluation system. Not only do we have to have facts about the duties and responsibilities of the positions but about the organization and its functions and personnel qualifications required. In most trades or professions you find that certain tools are essential to the accomplishment of work. The carpenter must have hammer and saw and nails; the dentist, his drilling and extracting equipment. Likewise, position evaluation officers must have tools and techniques to use in accomplishing their mission. Basically, they must have at their command techniques that will insure acquisition of current and accurate information on: organization, mission and functions of the work unit; data on procedures, flow of work and forms used; manner in which the position operates; lines of authority and responsibility; span of control; degree of specialization or functionalization. 25X1A

II. MATERIAL ON ORGANIZATION

There are a number of ways to get information on the organization and mission of Agency components for use in the position evaluation process. Among the best tools available for this purpose are various types of regulatory material, organizational charts, and official tables of organization.

It is a general practice of Position Evaluation Division to keep available all current regulatory issuances that may be required. Regulations [redacted] cover all major organizational segments of the Agency outlining their structure and function. These are used as the basic authority in ascertaining organizational structure, mission and functions of Agency components being reviewed. While it is indeed true that these regulations indicate the overall mission and functions for position evaluation needs, it is necessary to delve further into other controlling documents for more detail. In this connection, all CIA regulations must be reviewed for additional information that may be pertinent to the job or jobs being evaluated. For example, in reviewing voucher examiners concerned with field travel vouchers, evaluation officer should study [redacted] which is pertinent to this subject. Likewise, Agency directives, notices and NSCID directives; manuals prepared by operating components; directives and notices prepared by major components and/or offices often contain pertinent material.

25X1A

25X1A

Though not generally available, among the best means of establishing an overall graphic frame of references are organizational charts and functional statements on the activities to be surveyed.

Often the position evaluation officer participates in the development of current organizational charts and functional statements preparatory to conducting his survey of a specific organizational component. These charts must be in consonance with currently approved Agency regulations with respect to the broad mission and functions of the parent organization. In those cases where there are deviations, PED must secure concurrence of the Management Staff on such changes.

CIA uses Tables of Organization to document approved organizational structure and staffing patterns; therefore, they have a highly significant role as the current frame of reference for the position evaluation officer. While PED is the authority for initial classification of positions or subsequent reclassification either upward or downward, any request that involves major organizational changes and/or new functions must be coordinated with the Chief, Management Staff and be approved either by him or the DD/S before classification action can be completed.

III. JOB INFORMATION FACT-FINDING TOOLS

The foregoing tools are largely concerned with securing information about the organization; however, major emphasis should be placed in determining the duties and responsibilities and organizational relationships of positions to be evaluated. For this type of fact-finding, we have available a number of tools and techniques.

A. Questionnaires

One of the most important fact-finding tools is the questionnaire, which is a formal device to get the most significant job facts from the employees or supervisors through the presentation of a series of questions on topics. These usually require detailed answers from the employee. For example, to clarify delegation of authority the questionnaire may require a written statement as to what types of cases are "signed off" by the individual and what types of actions require review by supervisors. The questionnaire may or may not request illustrations of cases in the two categories. A series of similar questions are answered in this manner by the employee prior to the position evaluation officer's appearing on the scene. The completed questionnaires are submitted to PED for review and consideration as to additional data required to complete the evaluation of the positions. In this manner specific job information can be secured on a mass basis with a minimum of effort on the part of the operating officials. In addition, it furnishes immediate support to the individual who is assigned to review and evaluate such positions in terms of having at hand pertinent job information.

While there are many advantages in using these questionnaires, such as furnishing guidelines to employees to be used in preparing their position descriptions and securing fairly detailed answers to specific questions and there are some definite disadvantages

unless a tight control is exercised. For example, these questionnaires should be distributed personally by the position evaluation officer to the employees either individually or in groups so that all questions that come up may be answered and instructions understood. Without this safeguard, it is possible for employees to take off on wild tangents and write a 20 to 30 page position description covering in detail all elements of the job whereas in many cases a brief summary would suffice.

A problem arises in the use of questionnaires when the employees dealt with do not have any writing ability. This is more apt to happen in such positions as those of truck drivers, chauffeurs, couriers, or mechanics. For these categories a check list type of questionnaire can be used, which is often much more satisfactory since it does not require the preparation of any involved narrative answers. A number of questionnaires of work sheets have been developed within PED for various types of Agency positions. At the end of this section are examples of two of these -- the first one, Questionnaire I for secretarial positions and the other, Questionnaire II, for project positions.

In the questionnaire developed for secretarial positions, you will note that there are nine major headings which cover the principal duties generally performed by secretaries in various Federal Agencies as well as private business. When one of these questionnaires is presented to a secretary, she can develop a statement of duties by coordinating all related tasks under these headings. It may be that many tasks cannot be isolated and grouped under these broad headings, but there is no prohibition against the employee's repeating important tasks under more than one heading. If these tasks are enumerated more than once, it is important that the evaluation officer give credit for them only once. It may be pointed out here that the major difference between CIA secretarial position and clerk-stenographic positions is the fact that secretaries work for one person or in some cases for a Chief and his Deputy, whereas clerk stenographers generally work for a group of professional or administrative employees.

Most projects involve peculiar problems in evaluation due to both sensitivity of activity and physical remotives from the PED scene of action. Questionnaire II shows the type of assistance which may be provided through a series of topical guidelines for setting down the essential information.

QUESTIONNAIRE I

SUGGESTED ITEMS OF INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO SECRETARIAL POSITIONS

The following items are suggested to assist employees in the preparation of position descriptions, and to obtain information necessary to the proper evaluation of positions. They are not intended to be all-inclusive, but only suggestive of the elements of difficulty and responsibility usually found in such positions, and significant in the determination of the classification.

Give a brief statement of the functions for which your office is responsible.

I. CONTACTS

(a) What contacts do you have outside and within agency? What types of information do you seek and relay?

(b) What responsibility do you have for arranging or organizing appointments for your superior? Do you schedule or determine priority of one caller against another? If so, what do you use as a basis for these decisions?

(c) What type of informational requests do you supply personally? What type of informational requests do you refer to your superior, his subordinates, other sections or divisions for answering?

(d) How do you keep informed of your superior's viewpoint? Who relies on you for specific information regarding the viewpoint of your superior - examples. How do you determine the extent to which you may reflect your superior's view point?

(e) How much authority do you have for interpreting instructions to subordinates if any? Type of instructions interpreted - by example.

(f) What responsibility do you have for organizing conferences? Describe in detail. In arranging such meetings, what information do you impart to conferees -- time, date, subject, etc.?

II. COMPOSING CORRESPONDENCE (estimate percentage of time spent in this work)

(a) What type of correspondence do you compose primarily (1) informational letters patterned on previous letters or following standardized paragraphs?

(b) Letters requiring a subject matter knowledge of the work of the unit, department or agency as a whole? Attach examples of typical letters and indicate just what you contributed.

(c) Does your superior give you detailed or any broad or general instructions as to contents of replies which you compose?

(d) What search must be made to compose replies? Where?

III. REVIEWING INCOMING AND OUTGOING MAIL

(a) Do you read and distribute incoming mail to the office? If so, on what basis do you assign mail to superior, other office personnel, yourself?

(b) What kind of follow-up letters do you keep?

(c) What outgoing correspondence do you review? What for? Does this review include subject matter (such as accuracy of data, conformance with office policy, etc.) and style (clarity of expression, wording, etc.) and on what do you base your decision?

(d) Are you permitted to rewrite such correspondence? If so, give examples.

(e) If review is for accuracy of data, how do you determine accuracy or inaccuracy?

IV. SECURING INFORMATION

(a) What information do you obtain for use of superior? Variety of subjects covered? What is information used for (e.g., articles, speeches, reports, correspondence, important conferences, trips)?

(b) What sort of instructions are you given as to information or material needed; as to sources of data?

(c) From what sources do you obtain information (e.g., files, library, other offices, other government departments)?

(d) What is involved in gathering information (e.g., selecting, consolidating, re-arranging, summarizing, excerpting, or correlating data)? Give examples.

(e) Do you prepare any written reports incorporating information gathered? If so, give examples.

V. TAKING AND TRANSCRIBING DICTATION

(a) In what subject matter fields is dictation given?

(b) Do you take shorthand notes of conferences, interviews, hearing, or other meetings? At what rate or speed? Verbatim?

Or approximately verbatim? Or briefed? If briefed, who decides what you take down in your notes? How many people participated? How many conferences or other meetings per week, month, do you report and what is average amount of time involved in taking and transcribing such notes? Do you write the minutes verbatim or summarized? To whom are minutes distributed and for what purpose used?

(c) Do you listen in and take shorthand or longhand notes of telephone conversations? Local or long distance calls? For what purpose is record used? How many persons usually speaking over the phone? Per cent of time taking and transcribing telephone calls? Is this verbatim or selective of statements to be recorded?

VI. SETTING UP AND MAINTAINING FILES

(a) What files do you maintain or participate in the planning of? Describe how they are set up?

(b) Do you maintain a library? If so, what does it contain?

VII. SUPERVISION

Do you supervise any employees? If so, what responsibility do you have for: training, making assignments, review of work, approval of leave, marking of efficiency ratings, discipline and instruction as to form, procedures, contents, in the performance of their tasks?

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

(a) Recommendations for changes in work policies and procedures and on what are they based? To whom are they made?

(b) Analysis and revision of forms used in section. On what basis?

(c) Allotment of space, moving and telephones.

(d) Personnel work such as: interviewing applicants, recruiting employees, approving requests for transfer, recommending promotions.

(e) Direction of various campaigns in your section, such as War Bond, Community War Fund, or Red Cross?

IX. MISCELLANEOUS

(a) When you answer the telephone, how do you refer calls: i.e., all to your superior, ascertain business of the caller and supply answers personally, refer calls to superior's suboridinates? Give examples of type answers you give without consulting superior --

where do you get data for these replies? How do you determine proper referral?

(b) Do you perform any of the following duties: keep time and leave records, order and distribute office supplies and furniture, keep budget records, make arrangements for duplicating or printing services?

(c) How frequently is your superior out of town? What travel arrangements do you make for his trip? To whom do you route matters while he is away? Do your duties differ while he is away? If so, in what way?

QUESTIONNAIRE II

FOR OBTAINING INFORMATION ON PROJECT POSITIONS

1. Type of Project (FI, PP, PM, etc.):

[redacted] 25X1C

3. Operational budget:

4. Purpose of project including general target information and scope of activity:

5. General outline of specific types of duty assignments accomplished by incumbent and problems involved:

6. Authority to act on assigned tasks; consequence of error:

7. Reporting authority vested in position (through field station or or direct to headquarters):

8. Supervisory responsibility (type and number of personnel including principal agents):

9. Type of supervision exercised over position (guidance and instruction provided and extent of review of finished product):

10. Nature of liaison activities including authority to make commitments; nature, frequency and level of contacts.

B. Reports

Program reports or compilations give a fairly good idea of what the organization is doing or plans to do over an extended period of time. An examination of these proposed program objectives and examples of work performed or proposed for the employees and/or components reveals to the position evaluation officer various facets of the program as they relate directly to positions being reviewed. In the evaluation process, there is an opportunity for the evaluator to see examples of employee-prepared reports. He determines how much of the work is original research and how much review is exercised over the employee. Through study of such work products, the duties of the position are clarified.

C. Manuals

Manuals provide a fruitful source of information on positions. To understand the details of some positions, the position evaluation officer must thoroughly comprehend certain procedural or operating manuals. For example, in reviewing fiscal accounting positions in the Office of the Comptroller or the appointment clerk positions in the Records Services Division in the Office of Personnel where it is necessary to understand in detail the work processes involved, the position evaluation officer must become intimately familiar with such manuals as the Civil Service Handbook, SA-12, which covers the basic personnel records and files systems of Federal Agencies and is used by CIA.

D. Interviews

Another item to be considered is the interview technique. Although costly if used exclusively, it serves a number of useful purposes difficult to accomplish in other ways and provides an opportunity for the position evaluation officer to:

a. Establish rapport with theincumbent and his supervisor.

b. To become familiar with the actual job processes.

c. Examine the work performed (through desk audit of the position); establish the degree of supervisory control over the position as well as to secure management (supervisory) agreement as to the exact perimeter of the position.

d. See various types of work products, such as work reports, examples of problems under consideration, types of decisions to be made in connection with the completion of work assignments, and nature of delegation of authority.

e. Secure pertinent job facts through interviews with cognizant staff specialists who can speak authoritatively about operational programs, organizational structure, missions, functions, or any problems connected with the foregoing.

IV. COMBINED USE OF TOOLS

The aids to position evaluation which have been discussed above may be used in varying combinations as required by different situations. Just how and when these are to be used is left to the discretion of the position evaluation officer; but it may be safely said that having these tools at hand is a prerequisite for his doing a more thorough, effective job.

OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION

I. DEFINITION

Occupational classification is the study of the tasks, skills, knowledges, personal characteristics, physical and mental requirements of jobs in order to catalog and arrange them into orderly and systematic groups, families, fields, and/or series. The defining of these categories and arranging them into a coding structure is included in the process.

Occupational classification is not identical with position classification. Occupations can be classified without evaluation of level. Most of the work done by the Armed Forces has as its main objective manpower planning, utilization and training. The Dictionary of Occupational Titles, which is discussed at greater length under Section II, is also an occupational classification structure which does not deal in the relative values of jobs for purposes of compensation. On the other hand, you can set salary and wage rates without going through occupational classification. The Bell Telephone Laboratory Plan and many other industrial plans arrive at salary levels by ranking basic tasks. In the government as in any large-scale manpower exercise, particularly where professional occupations are involved, occupational classification is required.

II. EXAMPLES OF OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

The Civil Service Commission Handbook of Occupational Groups and Series of Classes established under the Federal position-classification plan is a basic reference in the field of personnel classification. It is kept current by the issuance of quarterly transmittal sheets. Its primary objective is salary and wage administration in conformance with the Classification Act of 1949. It serves as the official guide for the determination of the occupational category within which a given General Schedule position falls -- one of the essential steps in the classification process. There are twenty-three occupational groups or major subdivisions of the General Schedule, GS-000-0 through GS-2200-0, eight of which appear below:

GS-200-0 Personnel Administration and Industrial Relations Group
GS-300-0 General Administrative, Clerical, and Offices Services Group
GS-400-0 Biological Sciences Group
GS-500-0 Accounting and Budget Group
GS-800-0 Engineering Group
GS-1000-0 Fine and Applied Arts Group
GS-1600-0 Mechanic Group
GS-2100-0 Transportation Group

Each occupational group embraces a number of series of classes of positions in associated or related occupations, professions, or activities. There are a total of over five hundred series divided among twenty-three occupational groups. The Personnel Administration and Industrial Relations Group GS-200-0 comprises sixteen series, the following being examples of a few of them:

GS-203-0	Personnel Clerical Series
GS-211-0	Appointment and Status Changes Series
GS-212-0	Placement Series
GS-214-0	Test Rating Series
GS-223-0	Salary and Wage Administration Series
GS-242-0	Labor Arbitration Series
GS-250-0	Retirement Series

Another occupational classification structure which is used as a standard reference for industrial and business jobs in the United States is the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, commonly known as the D.O.T. It was first produced in 1939. The revision of 1949 contains 22,028 definitions of jobs and 40,023 titles, some jobs being known by more than one title. It consists of two volumes -- Volume I, "Definitions of Titles," arranged alphabetically, and Volume II, "Occupational Classification and Industry Index," arranged in numerical code order. There are seven broad subject categories as follows:

0-00.00 through 0-99.99	Professional and Managerial Occupations
1-00.00 through 1-99.99	Clerical and Sales Occupations
2-00.00 through 2-99.99	Service Occupations
3-00.00 through 3-99.99	Agricultural, Fishery, Forestry and Kindred Occupations
4-00.000 through 5-99.999	Skilled Occupations
6-00.000 through 7-99.000	Semi-skilled Occupations
8-00.00 through 9-99.99	Unskilled Occupations

For professional engineering and scientific occupations, other occupational structures have been established. The National Science Foundation, which is particularly interested in spotting shortages of personnel in critical scientific specializations maintains a roster of occupations. Also the American Society of Mechanical Engineers developed a compilation of Definitions of Occupational Specialties in Engineering as an amendment to its Survey of Selected Engineering Personnel. Specializations are classified under an appropriate code structure and defined. Such activities as research, procurement, testing, operation and teaching as applied to the various fields of engineering are covered.

The Army has a Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) System for codifying all military occupations in the Army -- officers as well as enlisted. There are 150 officer codes. The other branches of the Armed Forces also have occupational classification structures.

III. USES

Occupational classification provides a basic reference for most of the personnel transactions concerning a position. It is necessary for effective position evaluation, placement, recruitment, testing, promotion, reduction in force, compensation, military furlough, etc. Examples of personnel functions and activities to which it applies are:

1. The establishment of tables of organization by standardized job titles and codes.

2. The development of position standards and the comparison of positions with others of a similar nature for salary and wage purposes.

3. The establishment of systems for in-grade promotions or advanced in-grade hiring rates.

4. The establishment of competitive levels for RIF purposes.

5. The development of personnel statistics from official records.

6. Occupational coding of employee qualifications.

7. Career planning and rotation of employees within an occupational framework.

8. The understanding of newly developed job areas for job analysis and study.

9. Organization analysis and establishment of training requirements.

10. The determination of recruitment needs.

11. The listing of payroll titles for salary disbursement.

12. Manpower planning. The Agency has two programs of this type. One is carried out by the Support Planning Committee of the Career Service Planning Board engaged in budget planning of a three-year cycle. Personnel requirements must be determined in advance of actual need. The other program is concerned with mobilization planning. CIA maintains files in connection with every service plan - Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force. It is a statement of CIA's military requirements in the event of a hot war.

S-E-C-R-E-T

Approved For Release 2002/02/27 : CIA-RDP83-01004R000100040003-7

IV. CONCEPT OF THE CIA OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION STRUCTURE

Originally CIA followed the Civil Service Commission structure without change. With the growth of the Agency and the development of operational specialties, the CSC codes became inadequate. By 1952 there were literally thousands of positions from the [redacted] to nuclear scientists in the GS-132 Series. The process of bringing a large number of individual positions into an orderly array for close comparison with job precedents and standards had become extremely difficult. Machine coding of employee qualifications on a selection run might select hundreds of careers in one category leaving a hand-sort job of large proportions for the qualifications analyst. In determining a solution to the problem, the consideration which outweighed all others was Agency policy of conformance to the Classification Act of 1949. We could not depart far from the CSC class structure and remain within the stated policy. Therefore, the official Agency manual, [redacted] was developed from this central assumption. Since the classification structure is developed within the CSC framework, there is general conformance of groups and series even though for some Agency purposes another treatment might be more desirable. Intelligence is a process marked by unusual breadth of occupational coverage. Twenty-two, out of the twenty-three major CSC groups are represented -- all except the Copyright, Patent, and Trade-mark Group.

25X1C

25X1A

The CSC code is either a 3 or 4 digit code, e.g., GS-010 and GS-2200, while the CIA Handbook adaptation uses a 6 digit code, e.g., GS-0010.01 or GS-2200.01. This 6 digit form with its decimal system is more adaptable to machine recording and statistical computation. It also permits greater refinement -- the fifth and sixth digits being used in the CIA system to designate separate titles within each series.

In developing the CIA Handbook a new series was created for Intelligence Operations positions, the GS-0136.00, in recognition of the fact that these positions are peculiar to this Agency. Another change was made to end years of controversy in trying to distinguish between Clerk (Typing) and Clerk-Typist, by eliminating the former category completely and including all such positions within the Clerk-Typist series. The GS-132 or Intelligence Research Series was so crowded that it was decided to transfer intelligence positions requiring specialized professional knowledge to other appropriate series in the new occupational structure. For example, Intelligence Officer (General Economics) was placed in GS-0110.01 and Intelligence Officer (Electronic Engineer) in GS-0855.02. ORR was originally composed of economists, commodity specialists, and various types of engineers all assigned to the GS-132 Series. Positions were re-evaluated and re-coded to conform with the new CIA Occupational Handbook as closely as possible. As a result ORR was able to differentiate among specializations and cope better with personnel problems.

The CIA Handbook also includes a section for positions falling under wage administration systems such as Army-Air Force WB, LB, GP and GA; however, the preponderance of positions fall into the General Schedule category and most of the problems are confined to this area. Among the problems are such things as the old bugaboo "the human element." Also, there are mixed positions which are part one thing and part another and defy clear-cut alignment with any one title. Occasionally it is difficult to make distinctions as between engineers and technicians, administrative assistants and intelligence assistants, or among the various clerical specialties.

V. CONCLUSION

The test of any occupational classification system is in its operation. Does it do the job? Has it been validated? Is it accepted? In the case of the CIA Handbook all Agency T/O's now follow the coding system and all Agency components have reviewed and approved it. We think, therefore, that the structure does the job for which it was designed, and that it has been validated and accepted.

INDUSTRIAL JOB EVALUATION METHODS AND PRACTICES

I. INTRODUCTION

This discussion deals primarily with wage practices in several industrial companies and includes some actual experiences in salary and wage administration. There is no attempt to analyze the theory behind these practices and methods. Many books have been written on the theory of job evaluation and a short discussion such as this could not possibly cover all the relevant points. The text books deal with a variety of statistical curves, case studies and similar presentations; but when these theories and plans are actually applied in the classification of working levels, many adaptations must take place. For example, Western Electric Company and the Glenn L. Martin Company utilize National Electrical Manufacturers Association plans for both (1) shop and (2) clerical and technical jobs. While these plans were lifted in their entirety, there is a wide variance of interpretation as to their use.

One thing that should be understood concerning industrial companies is that there are two basic types of employees, management and union. The term "management employees" does not necessarily refer to executives or supervisors, but rather to those engaged in work such as personnel, engineering, and other professional categories which do not come under the auspices of the union. Therefore, we can actually express it as professional versus shop type jobs. There are some instances where engineering unions have come into being, but they are normally not nation-wide as industrial unions belonging to AFL or CIO. Most management employees do benefit, however, from any advantages gained by unions in their negotiation of labor contracts.

One other factor that should be considered is the relationship of organizational structure and position evaluation; or, as we know it here, management functions in conjunction with job evaluation duties. This combination enables the wage and salary administrator to influence and change basic organizational lines prior to evaluation of the positions. The advantages of this, I believe, are obvious. It also offsets the normal operational tendencies to reorganize for the purpose of obtaining higher grades.

II. JOB EVALUATION PLANS

Before further discussion, it appears suitable to duscuss briefly several types of plans in industry.

One that has been used widely in the past is the National Electrical Manufacturers Association plan, known as the NEMA job plan. Essentially, it is a point-method evaluation in which there are four

basic categories of factors -- skill, physical demands, responsibilities and job environment. These four general factors are broken down into eleven specific elements as shown below representing altogether a total of 100 points:

1. Skill — 50 Points
   a. Education
   b. Experience
   c. Initiative and Ingenuity

2. Physical Demands — 15 Points
   a. Physical and Mental Demands
   b. Visual Demands

3. Responsibilities — 20 Points
   a. For Equipment
   b. For Material
   c. For the Safety of Others
   d. For the Work of Others

4. Job Environment — 15 Points
   a. Working Conditions
   b. Job Hazards

For evaluation purposes, each of these eleven factors is broken down into five degrees in ascending order as to the difficulty encountered. This is fairly representative of most plans for shop jobs, presumably established by a variety of tests and actual application to existing jobs.

Another plan that I would like to discuss briefly is an oil refining company plan which was adapted by Glenn L. Margin. This could be categorized as the factor-comparison-point system. Under it the factors considered are (1) mental effort, (2) physical effort, (3) responsibilities and (4) working conditions. There is little fundamental difference in factors from the previous plan. This plan is used for executive, supervisory and professional jobs. The major difference in the use of this plan is the absence of arbitrary degrees of point ratings given on specific factors. Original ratings were obtained by analyzing and evaluating existing wage structures and jobs prior to the adaptation of this plan. Such bench-mark jobs were defined and evaluated by a variety of people and specific situations discussed in terms of the various factors. As an example, an engineer's job would rate heavily in <u>mental effort</u> as it has to do with the application of knowledge of fundamental theory of engineering, which normally requires previous academic training. Conversely, a shop foreman would not be as heavily weighted in the mental effort factor, but would be weighted more heavily in the <u>skill</u> factor, which denotes a type of know-how obtainable only from practical experience. He would not necessarily be a college graduate with academic training of the advanced type and a thorough grounding in the theories underlying engineering.

Thus, we have stated that the mental effort factor would pertain to academic training, knowledge of theories, etc., while skill would refer primarily to experience. Physical effort is obvious. In the physical effort factor insofar as this plan is concerned, too much delineation is neither necessary nor possible in the professional jobs; however, in positions where an individual is required to travel a great deal, this would be rated higher than normal office, non-traveling positions. Under responsibilities, there are a variety of breakdowns concerned with responsibility for people, materials, and equipment, for records and methods. Under each specific responsibility there are variations. For example, under responsibility for men it would be indicated whether the individual is responsible for technical supervision, labor relations activities, assignments of salary or the establishment of pay rates. Records would also be broken down as to creation, establishment, maintenance, etc. Working conditions do not vary greatly because of the similarity in types of jobs.

Here is an example of a practical approach to the problem in the evaluation of test pilots. Overall test pilots would not necessarily be extremely high in mental effort or skill. Since the general salary rate was known for these positions, the factors of responsibility, physical effort and working conditions were heavily weighted in order to bring the positions to a correct salary level. Procedures used and further problems in setting up such a plan as this will be discussed a little later.

Every job evaluation plan has many advantages and disadvantages. For example, some of the disadvantages of the NEMA type of point plan are as follows. The positions are arbitrarily set from a single set of jobs. The progression from one degree to the next is on an arithmetical basis. Fixed definitions cannot be suitable for all kinds of jobs. The whole arrangement is complicated, makes classification difficult and allows for no flexibility. The fact that all these criticisms are valid points out deficiencies in the NEMA plan. For example, on experience, first degree is 22 points, the second degree is 44 points and, in many cases, an arbitrary number of years of previous and on-the-job training have to be assigned, making it impossible to show deviation between jobs that would fall in the same general category. In the professional plan adopted by the Glenn L. Martin Company, many of these weaknesses are not present, because its flexible point method permits each factor to be slotted in true relationship to other jobs. It must be remembered that no plan is better than the manner in which it is maintained, and deviations can appear which will in the end distort the whole job evaluation pattern.

III. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

When a company endeavors either to change its existing classification plan or to install a new one, many things must be taken into consideration. There are, of course, a variety of plans on the market and a great variety of adaptations of these basic plans. Consideration

should be given as to which ones would be feasible for coverage of specific types of jobs. Consideration also has to be given as to how inclusive one plan should be. To illustrate poor planning, I would like to state the case of Glenn L. Martin. Currently, three plans are in use. One is the plan for shop jobs, another for clerical and technical jobs, and third, the factor-comparison-point plan, which covers the supervisory and professional positions. With all these plans in use, many times you have to toss a coin to decide when a position gets out of the technical class into the professional or supervisory class. Distortions appear in that some lower-graded jobs in the second plan are actually of greater importance than the lower-level jobs in the professional or supervisory plan.

As we discussed the factor-point plan used by Glenn L. Martin it could be noted that this basic plan, which I believe the text books call the "Cole" plan, was originally used for factory positions. While most of the adaptation was good, a little thought and common sense would have eliminated the need for the clerical and technical plan and permitted all non-union jobs to be allocated by one plan, thus avoiding overlapping and distortion at the top and bottom of the plans. So selection of the plan with consideration of the type of jobs to be covered and the coverage desired are very important. Poor judgement at this step of the game can invalidate any further work that is done regardless of how good it is. On the other hand, no matter how good the selection of a plan, how well thought out for proper coverage, it is necessary to include to a great extent the existing levels of previous wage structures. While I say it is necessary, theoretically this probably is not true. The text books say to scrap the old structure, to start Simon-pure, to take only those jobs which are reasonable and agreed upon to use as bench-mark positions. This is not always possible as it is hard to ignore the past. Essentially, when a new plan is established, bench-mark jobs must be isolated, analyzed and ranked. Bench-mark jobs are those jobs which appear, from a common sense view, to be rational and in proper relationship with one another. They can be taken either from jobs of long standing within the company or from industry-wide positions based on surveys of other plans.

The first step in establishing bench-mark positions is to form a group of committees composed of operating people. Four or five of these committees go over a list of positions in the plant for the express purpose of ranking them. The normal procedure is to start with a large number of jobs and when any disagreements come up, these jobs are eliminated. Thus, each individual committee performs a weeding out or selective process. In turn, the committees get together and reconcile four or five points of view. Further elimination takes place and, finally, after a long series of meetings, discussions, agreements, a set of positions are agreed upon. This then becomes the foundation of the plan to be instituted and is bound to carry over some of the past. In order to issustrate this use of the bench-mark position, I will go through quickly the steps taken by Glenn L. Martin on the

adaptation of their plan. The bench-mark positions ranged from department heads and shop superintendents, down through engineers and lesser supervisory positions. As a point of departure, the amount of monthly salary attached to these positions was designated as the number of points which would apply to this level job. Of course, in positions like engineers where there was a variety of salaries paid for the particular type of work done, an average was obtained. Then it was decided, because of the wage structure of the jobs being studied, to have job grades from number 23 through 35. This having been decided arbitrarily, ranges were devised by dividing the difference between the points at the top and at the bottom by 12, thus setting the number of points for each grade. Then by a simple process of arithmetic, point ranges for each grade were established. The next step necessary was to look into the composition of each individual job. This provided the overall points necessary for the bench-mark positions and the range of points for each level of positions. Next, each committee assigned overall points on each of the factors which were, as you remember, mental effort, skill, responsibility, physical effort and working conditions. Each committee endeavored to come up with something logical which all could agree upon. Then the committees got together to reconcile their differences. There now were, in addition to the number of grades and point ranges, the weighted factors for each bench-mark job. Then the fun started. Classification committees took a variety of other jobs and attempted to apply the criteria just developed. Theoretically, it should have been perfect, but bugs had crept in, and there was only one thing left to do -- be practical and after checking a variety of positions, start to fudge on setting point ranges to make necessary adjustments. After long periods of horse trading, conniving, etc., the variations were included and the plan was ready to use.

IV. MAINTENANCE OF PLAN

The following is a typical organization used to maintain the job evaluation plan. Under the wage and salary administrator who reports to the vice-president for industrial relations, there is a job evaluation and wage survey section. In addition, there is a job-grading committee responsible for approving all the grades recommended by the job evaluation unit. This committee is composed from all elements of the plant, such as engineers, and shop and professional personnel. The normal procedures of job evaluation are very similar to those encountered in government. Analysts are assigned to organizational segments and expected to maintain classification support as necessary. Job evaluation units are responsible for issuing job authorization statements on individual organizational components. These are the equivalent of our T/O's but infinitely less cumbersome including only the title, grade and code number of each fundamental job. Thus, in an engineering outfit of 300 to 600 people, there may be ten positions listed on an authorization sheet covering supervisory, three levels of engineering and some associated clerical jobs. Records in the job evaluation unit consist of files of job descriptions numerically designated, lists of job authorization sheets for each component covered and sundry job analysis information to justify position allocation. Upon request for a new job or for positions audited in the normal phase, position descriptions are written and completed with a sutstantiating data sheet.

For ease in handling the factor comparison play, 3" x 5" card files are set up to show every job allocated with the number of points assigned to it, as well as a breakdown of points and the reason for the points under each factor. Therefore, after the facts are formulated into a position description, the analyst reviews the card file and compares each factor individually with those of similar positions. As you see, this plan allows actual comparison on one factor for all types of jobs. Five or six very similar jobs are pegged; these are then taken and analyzed carefully and a point scoring setup in true relationship to the jobs compared. This procedure is used for each factor, then the points added up and the result is the grade. This position is then submitted to the job-grading review committee who approves it or changes it. While 99% of the decisions are not changed, it involves taking the heat off job analysis or classification units.

Industry accentuates the use of fundamental job sheets. As an example of this, a coverage of 25,000 employees at Glenn L. Martin was accomplished with some 600 job sheets. Of course, it should be realized that in shop operations one job description will cover a variety of people. For illustration, the Assemblyman Third Class covered roughly 4,000 people. On the surface this seems a real short cut; however, when a job description is prepared, it is necessary to be familiar with all positions and fundamental functions performed by individuals to be covered by this job description. These descriptions have to be sufficiently broad and general to cover all the various jobs, yet distinct enough in delineation from the next grade to be used as a fundamental document in a union arbitration case. It is not unusual, therefore, to take one to three months to get the facts, analyze them and write and allocate a job sheet. Primarily in shop type jobs the supervisor is interviewed and, in addition, if possible, the job actually observed. As an example of the type of detail necessary, an analysis of all the weights that will be lifted by an employee during the course of an eight-hour tour may be required. Under the NEMA plan in shop type work there are five degrees of physical demands based on the percentage of time involved in lifting certain ranges of weights. In many union cases involving a grievance, it may be necessary to spend several days just obtaining this type of information.

In setting up a new organization a supervisory interview is used exclusively. Take, for example, a new engineering branch. The person in charge defines the functions which are necessary. Classifiers then discuss these functions with him and obtain his view on the type of organization he wants. Then, because wage and salary administration has authority for both organization and job grades, a discussion of the best way to set up the new organization takes place. Normally, agreement is easily reached. If, for some reason, an agreement cannot be reached ultimately, the vice president for industrial relations and the vice president for engineering meet and resolve the problem. Then fundamental job sheets are written. The analyst determines the number of engineering sheets to be written and the cases in which existing sheets can be applied. Normally, there are a senior engineer, engineer,

junior engineer, secretary steno, and perhaps a clerk. Sheets are then allocated and a table of organization issued to the component. As you noted, I stated a minimum number of grades. For example, engineering grades normally have 3 levels, the junior engineer, engineer, and the senior engineer. These possibly fall into grade levels 25, 27 and 29. Rarely do job family groups go from one consecutive grade to another. Thus more fundamental differences between jobs can be established and a cursory review can quickly determine whether a job is an engineer or a senior engineer.

V. PAY SCALES

Most industry pay scales provide for a wide overlapping between grades. As a rule, the rate ranges within a grade are considerably broader than those of government and go up progressively at the upper levels. Thus, it is possible for two engineers in the same grade to be making a difference of $100 or more a month in salary. As rate ranges normally have four or five steps in the case of professional or supervisory jobs, merit ratings are given on accomplishment only. In the case of lower paid or union type jobs, progress up through half the wage range is automatic on a time-in-grade basis; thereafter, any raises are given on merit alone. This, of course, makes for more flexibility and provides the means for rewarding a deserving employee.

Each company maintains a salary survey section under the wage and salary administrator to obtain the going wages for various types of work through surveys of the locality. This involves actual excursions to a number of different companies, checking job sheets, observing work, making comparisons to ascertain where this job would be rated in the analyst's own company plan. This wage information is used for wage adjustments and in union contract negotiations. To illustrate this variation among areas, the Western Electric Company utilized the same grade plan in all its plants; however, identical jobs having the same description and in the same grade level, would well vary in pay because of different local conditions in, for example, Winston Salem and Allentown, or Baltimore and Chicago.

VI. UNION DEALINGS

One of the most important things a company has to face is its relationships and dealings with unions. Most industrial plants are covered by industrial unions such as auto workers and electrical workers. These unions take an active interest in job-grading plans and their use as well as wages and working conditions. Normally, a labor union has to agree to work under a specified job-grade plan; therefore, once a plan is installed and has union approval, it is rarely changed. Normally, a union has a copy of the grading plan in use and has its experts to interpret it. Each job sheet that is allocated is sent to the union who has a certain period to protest. If the union protests, it goes through as is, but any reversal action based on a grievance would be retroactive from date of protest. Many times the union automatically protests each allocation. This then goes through normal appeal procedures and ends up, in accordance with union contract,

in the hands of either the mediator or arbitrator. This is one good reason why job sheets must be carefully written and accurately documented. More numerous than approval of job grades are the grievances concerning whether an individual is doing one grade of job or another. Adequate procedures are usually set up so that a worker who feels he is doing higher grade work than he is being paid for can appeal to his union steward who in turn goes to the first line supervisor. If nothing is accomplished at this level, it goes higher until it lands in an industrial relations manager's hands or in arbitration. In the first step of the grievance a job evaluation analyst is called in to obtain all the facts, audit the job and prepare recommendations. This is a detailed and time-consuming chore and has to be done accurately because if the case is not presented strongly enough and denied, it will eventually go to arbitration. This is both costly and time-consuming. Job analysts are often called upon as witnesses in arbitration cases.

A certain amount of distortion in job grades results from union contract negotiations. Generally the union has a certain number of jobs it wishes raised in grade level. During the course of negotiations, horse trading takes place, and in the give and take certain jobs are upgraded. This again is a practical approach not conforming with good theories; and if too much of this approach is used, relationships become so distorted that the job evaluation plan is not of much account.

VII. COMPARISON OF GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY

Very briefly I would like to point out some of the differences in the industrial and governmental approach. Use of fundamental job sheets and a limited number of job levels within job-family grades are characteristic of industry as against more individualized sheets and the presence of more grade levels within job families in government. An important factor is the budgetary aspect utilized by industry as pointed out previously. No set figure for the ratio of senior engineers to engineers to junior engineers is set by job evaluation in the position authorization sheets. The overall function has been previously analyzed and so much money allocated. For employee services, the supervisor is allowed flexibility as to the number of employees he thinks necessary at each grade level. It is to his advantage to select the right types of employees in the right proportion to get the work done. If he decides to have all senior engineers, he would curtail the number of his staff and his production would likely not meet fixed schedules. This would require considerable justification on the part of the supervisor to explain his actions or to even keep his position.

Another factor to be considered is in more flexible pay scales and the ability of industry to realign the rates as necessary. Also of particular note, is the fact that sufficient flexibility is achieved by the use of merit increases so that individual performance can be rewarded regardless of time-in-grade or seniority. Another point is that of the combined functions of organizations and job evaluation into

one component. In industry where efficiency and profit are paramount, this aids in simplifying and expediting normal support processes. Overall, the presence of a tangible product and the profit and loss motivation are the major differences between government and industry.

AGENCY PAY ADMINISTRATION

I. PAY PLANS

There are three Agency pay plans with which Position Evaluation Division is concerned -- Classification Act Plan, covering well over 90% of the Agency employees; Wage Board Plan, covering a very small percentage of the total number of employees; and Negotiated Wage Plan, an even smaller percentage.

Personnel under the Classification Act Plan - also referred to as graded personnel - are paid on a per annum basis and occupy positions paid in accordance with the compensation schedules fixed by law for General Schedule positions. In accordance with the provisions of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 the following is the present basic pay scale:

Per Annum Rates within Grade

	GS-1	2690
	GS-2	2960
1	GS-3	3175
	GS-4	3415
	GS-5	3670
	GS-6	4080
	GS-7	4525
	GS-8	4970
	GS-9	5440
	GS-10	5915
	GS-11	6390
	GS-12	7570
	GS-13	8990
	GS-14	10320
	GS-15	11610
	GS-16	12900
	GS-17	13975
	GS-18	16000

Remainder of salary table is omitted since it is outdated.

Personnel in positions under the Wage Board and Negotiated Wage plans, also referred to as ungraded positions, are compensated according to schedules established by the Office of Personnel in accordance with prevailing locality wage rates and practices.

These three plans are further described as to coverage and other characteristics in "Agency Pay Plans" the summary immediately following:

Approved For Release 2002/02/27 : CIA-RDP83-01004R000100040003-7

In 1968, the Coordinated Federal Wage System was established by the USCSC. This action resulted in the abolishment of previous Federal departmental wage administration systems.

CIA now follows the CFWS policies and wage standards and schedules, where applicable.

S-E-C-R-E-T

AGENCY P. PLANS

PLAN	SCHEDULE	COVERAGE	CHARACTERISTICS
I. Classification	GS-General Schedule	Positions in administrative, intelligence research, intelligence operations, professional, scientific, technical and clerical fields.	Rates for each grade level are established by and can be changed only by Congressional action. The Agency has elected to utilize the schedule without modification. Schedule consists of 18 grade levels of progressive difficulty and responsibility with provision for periodic step advancement for satisfactory service with the first 17 grades. also, 3 longevity steps are provided for additional service for positions in grades 1 through 15.
II. Wage Board	WB-Regular Wage Board	Non-supervisory positions in the trades, crafts, equipment operating, and labor occupations excepting reproduction.	Rates are established and revised for each locality by the Office of Personnel consistent with results of surveys of the various wage localities by the Army-Air Force Wage Board. Schedule is composed of approximately 20 grade levels, each having four steps to recognize longevity and satisfactory service.
	WBS-Regular Wage Board Supervisory	Supervisory positions in the trades, crafts, and labor occupations excepting reproduction.	Same as WB schedule except that the supervisory schedule is composed of 15 grade levels. The lowest WBS level is equivalent roughly to WB-6 in compensation and skill.
	LB-Lithographic Wage Board	Positions in the lithographic trade associated with offset reproduction activities similar to Department of Defense printing plants.	Rates established and revised by the Office of Personnel based on surveys of the Washington, D. C. locality by the Inter-Departmental Lithographic Wage Board. Schedules are closely comparable to those applicable to the Regular Wage Board (WB) Pay Plan except the LB Schedule covers supervisory as well as non-supervisory positions.

S-E-C-R-E-T

PLAN	SCHEDULE	COVERAGE	CHARACTERISTICS
III. Negotiated Wage	GP-Government Printing	Positions in reproduction activities including offset and plate printing comparable to operations of the Government Printing Office	Rates are established and revised by the Office of Personnel based upon wage rates negotiated by employee groups of GPO with the Public Printer and approved by Congressional Committee on printing. Schedule consists of flat journeyman rates for each specialty (e.g., Photoengraver) and a five year progressive apprenticeship plan with apprenticeship rates at 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, and 90% of the journeyman rate for the first through fifth year of the apprenticeship respectively.
	GA-Graphic Arts	Positions in specialized reproduction activities including engraving and somewhat comparable to certain operations at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department.	Rates for each specialty are established and revised by the Office of Personnel on the basis of wage rates for positions in similar fields of work approved by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department. The latter rates are predicted upon Government Printing Office rates, where the positions are similar, and upon the results of negotiations between the Bureau Director and representatives of concerned Bureau employee groups in other cases, the basis for negotiation consisting of prevailing rates existing in localities in which major private engraving and printing plants are located. For journeyman positions, a base rate is established (6th year journeyman) with varying number (according to specialty) of advanced journeyman rates (e.g., 7th, 8th, and 9th year rates) to recognize seniority in the speccialty concerned. For apprenticeship positions, the plan as set forth for Government Printing (GP) positions is followed, with apprenticeship rates based on the appropriate percentage of the base (6th year) journeyman rate.

II. PAY ADMINISTRATION

25X1A

Agency Regulation [redacted] covers Pay Administration in considerable detail in the matter of night differential, periodic step-increases, and longevity step-increases. Night differential payments are in conformance with customary Federal practices. Both periodic and longevity step-increases as provided for in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are granted to CIA General Schedule employees in accordance with the principles and practices of that Act.

Since Agency Wage Administration Pay Plans are based on pay plans and wage schedules in effect in other governmental organizations, it is the policy of the Agency to award step increases to ungraded employees consistent insofar as practicable with the established practice in the agency or agencies whose plan is adopted to our use. It is to the interest of the Agency that these step increases, when authorized, be earned and granted as an incentive for improved performance and to recognize longevity. In addition to step-increase provisions, these pay plans provide for the periodic adjustment of compensation levels in accordance with prevailing rates in the locality or industry concerned on the basis of wage surveys, conducted by Government wage boards or other administrative action. Provisions are specifically outlined in OPM 20-605-9 "Wage Administration Step-Increases" dated 27 December 1956.

The Civil Service Commission from time to time establishes appointment salary levels for positions in certain occupational series at rates in excess of the base grade levels. The Director of Personnel is authorized to adopt and apply these salary levels to similarly classified Agency positions. OPM 20-605-8 "Pay Administration - Basic Compensation Schedules" dated 25 September 1956, provides such a list which includes positions in Professional Engineering, Physical Science, and Medical Categories. These higher salary entrance levels are set primarily to meet the competition of private industry for individuals with the desired qualifications.

III. SALARY AND WAGE DETERMINATIONS

There are many salary and wage determinations which must be made in connection with individual personnel actions. The criteria for making such determinations are rather detailed, based on statutory requirements, decisions of the Comptroller and the Office of the General Counsel and other regulatory material. These guidelines have been issued in OPM 20-605-10, "Salary and Wage Determinations" dated 19 February 1957, which is quoted immediately below:

1. GENERAL

This memorandum sets forth guidelines and requirements for making salary and wage determinations affecting staff employees and staff agents. These determinations are the responsibility of the officer approving a personnel action for authentication by the Director of Personnel. In making such determinations, he will adhere to all statutory requirements, pay determination decisions of the Comptroller General and Office of the General Counsel, and the provisions of this memorandum.

2. EXERCISE OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION IN DETERMINING PAY RATES

In making pay rate determinations in which any one of several scheduled pay rates may be selected within statutory requirements, the determination shall be made in consideration of the following discretionary factors:

a. Extent and nature of the individual's prior Federal and Agency service;

b. Degree to which the individual is qualified for the position;

c. Resulting salary alignment within the unit to which the individual is assigned.

3. CREDITING OF PAY RATES EARNED IN CREDITABLE PRIOR FEDERAL SERVICE

a. Creditable Federal employment for this purpose is employment in a position in the executive departments, independent establishments and agencies in the executive branch, corporations wholly owned by the United States, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia, irrespective of whether such position is subject to the pay schedules of the Classification Act. No consideration may be given to premium rates or to rates paid while employed as experts, consultants, or independent contractors, rates paid while serving under a temporary promotion, or rates attached to a position which the employee was subsequently found to have been disqualified to hold.

b. Pay rates earned in creditable prior Federal service may be considered in making current salary and wage determinations, including pay rates during Agency service as a contract employee. The pay rate considered in this case is the current equivalent of the highest rate the individual has received in creditable Federal employment.

c. Prior rates to be creditable for subsequent personnel actions must have been held for a continuous period of 90 days without a break in service.

d. The current equivalent of prior pay rates is computed as follows:

(1) If the highest previous rate was earned in a position compensated according to the Classification Act or a Wage Administration schedule, the current equivalent of that rate will be determined by reference to the pay schedules which have been in effect during the intervening period between the time the highest rate was earned and the present time and converting the former rate to the corresponding step and rate of the current schedule.

(2) If the highest previous rate was earned in a position not compensated according to the Classification Act or Wage Administration schedules, the former rate will be increased by the subsequent amendments to the Classification Act Schedule which were enacted during a period when the employee was <u>not</u> on the rolls of an office under the Classification Act or Wage Administration schedules, e.g., FSS and FSR schedules of the State Department or schedules of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Atomic Energy Commission.

e. In making pay determinations, whenever the current equivalent of the highest prior rate falls between two steps of the new grade, either the higher or the lower step may be utilized, unless specific provision is otherwise made in this memorandum. Normally, the higher step will be used unless a consideration of the three discretionary factors set forth in paragraph 2 establishes a reason for using the lower step.

4. DOCUMENTATION OF PAY CHANGES

a. Changes in rates of pay (other than step-increases and application of advanced base or in-hiring rates) may be made only in conjunction with an official personnel action which assigns an individual to an established position or which effects a change from one established position to another.

b. The specific rate of pay should be determined at the time the action is effected. However, if it is not possible to obtain verification of a former pay rate prior to effecting the action, and it is desired to afford the individual the benefit of his former rate of pay, the action may be processed at the rate of pay which is the minimum step of the grade or the highest step allowable based on prior employment which can be verified at the time, with this statement on the SF-50: "Salary rate

shown is subject to adjustment upon verification of prior rates obtained in the Federal Service." Observance of this procedure will provide a legal basis for retroactive adjustment of the pay rate through subsequent issuance of a corrected SF-50.

c. The Records and Services Division is authorized to establish the salary rate of individuals transferring to the Agency from other Federal agencies without change in grade when the individual has received a periodic step-increase between the time processing action was begun on his appointment and the time of his entrance on duty, provided he has with him either a final SF-50 or, if he has not yet received his final SF-50, a copy of SF-1126 reflecting the increase.

5. EFFECT OF ADVANCED BASE RATES FOR CLASSIFICATION ACT SCHEDULE POSITIONS APPROVED UNDER SECTION 104, P.L. 763, 83rd CONGRESS

Advanced base rates become the minimum or new base rates for each position affected for purposes of applying the provisions of this memorandum. OPM 20-605-8 (54-56) provides a listing of positions for which advanced base rates are authorized.

6. APPOINTMENT ACTIONS - CLASSIFICATION ACT SCHEDULE POSITIONS

a. Appointment will be made at the current minimum rate established for the position to which appointment is to be made, except when the individual has previously attained a higher pay rate in creditable Federal employment.

b. An appointee whose highest previous rate and last earned rate are the same, or whose last earned rate exceeds previous rates, may receive the last earned rate if it matches a step of the grade concerned; if the rate falls between two steps of the grade, the higher step will be used unless a consideration of the discretionary factors listed in paragraph 2 above establishes a reason for using the lower step.

c. An individual whose highest previous rate exceeds the last earned rate may be appointed at any rate in the grade from the last earned rate to the rate which corresponds to the highest previous rate. Rate selected will be based on the discretionary factors.

d. When the appointee's last earned rate consists of a step rate above the maximum scheduled step of a Classification Act Schedule position as the result of receipt of one or more longevity step-increases, and he is being appointed to a Classification Act Schedule position of the same or lower grade, his pay may be set at a comparable step above the maximum scheduled rate for the grade.

e. If an employee is being appointed and simultaneously promoted or changed to lower grade without a break in service, the rate for entrance on duty will be determined in accordance with the provisions of this memorandum relating to the specific type of personnel action.

7. APPOINTMENT ACTIONS - WAGE ADMINISTRATION POSITIONS

a. Appointments to apprentice positions on Government Printing (GP) or Graphic Arts (GA) Wage Schedules will be at the apprenticeship step commensurate with the experience and training of the individual in the trade concerned as evaluated by the appointing officer. Prior pay rates received in creditable Federal employment are not considered.

b. Appointments to journeyman or supervisory positions in Government Printing Schedule (GP) positions will be at the flat rate applicable to the position, prior Federal pay rates notwithstanding.

c. Appointments to journeyman positions compensated under the Graphic Arts Schedule (GA) will be at the yearly journeyman rate for which the employee qualifies based on his training and experience in the trade as evaluated by the appointing officer. Appointments to supervisory (Foreman) positions on this schedule will be at the yearly journeyman step for which the individual qualifies, to which will be added the foreman differential.

d. Appointments to Regular Wage Board (WB), Wage Board Supervisory (WBS), and Lithographic Wage Board (LB) positions will be made at Step 1 of the wage board grade unless advanced in-hiring rates have been approved for a particular position, in which case all new appointments are made at the advanced rate. However, if the appointee has had prior Federal service at a higher rate, he may be given the step of the wage board grade equivalent to the prior rate. If the prior rate falls between two steps of the grade, either step may be used in consideration of the discretionary factors. An individual appointed from a position compensated under the same type wage schedule but from another wage locality, may be appointed at the wage rate on the wage schedule for the new locality applicable to the numbered grade and step last held; or the pay rate in dollars and cents last received may be used in determining the step for his entrance on duty if this provides a higher pay rate.

8. PROMOTIONS - BETWEEN CLASSIFICATION ACT SCHEDULE POSITIONS

a. Whenever an employee is promoted from one Classification Act Schedule position to another of higher grade, his salary rate shall be fixed at the lowest step of the new grade which exceeds the last earned rate by one full step rate of the grade from

which promoted. If there is no rate in the higher grade which is at least one step rate above the employee's last earned rate, his salary will be fixed at the maximum scheduled step rate of the higher grade or at his last earned rate, whichever is higher.

b. If an individual's highest previous rate exceeds the pay rate for a promotion as determined in accordance with the provisions of the previous paragraph, the rate upon promotion may be established at the highest scheduled rate of the grade to which promoted which does not exceed the highest previous rate.

9. PROMOTIONS - REGULAR WAGE BOARD, WAGE BOARD SUPERVISORY, AND LITHOGRAPHIC WAGE BOARD POSITIONS

a. An individual promoted from one Wage Board position to another Wage Board position shall receive the lowest rate of the grade of the new position which exceeds his existing rate of pay. The highest previous rate, however, may be credited in establishing the rate of pay in the new grade as in Classification Act Schedule positions.

b. In those instances where the employee has completed all eligibility requirements for a periodic step-increase in a higher grade and the application of the foregoing rule does not result in the employee receiving an "equivalent increase," the pay rate in the higher grade will be fixed in the next higher step which will provide such an increase (except step 4). (For example, promotions to the first step in WB, WBS, or LB grades with six months service without an equivalent increase or to second step with 12 months service without an equivalent increase will require fixing pay at the next higher step.)

10. PROMOTIONS - GRAPHIC ARTS (GA) SCHEDULE AND GOVERNMENT PRINTING (GP) SCHEDULE POSITIONS

An individual promoted from one position on either the GA or GP schedule to another position on either schedule will receive only the appropriate journeyman or apprenticeship step to which he is entitled based on an evaluation of his training and experience.

11. PROMOTIONS - BETWEEN CLASSIFICATION ACT SCHEDULE POSITIONS AND WAGE BOARD (WB, WBS, LB) POSITIONS AND NEGOTIATED WAGE (GP, GA) POSITIONS

An individual promoted from a Classification Act Schedule position to a Wage Board position, or vice versa, shall receive the lowest rate of the grade of the position to which promoted which exceeds his existing rate of pay.

12. PROMOTIONS - BETWEEN CLASSIFICATION ACT SCHEDULE OR WAGE BOARD SCHEDULE (WB, WBS, LB) POSITIONS AND NEGOTIATED WAGE (GP, GA) POSITIONS

a. An individual promoted from a Classification Act Schedule or Wage Board position or a position under the Graphic Arts (GA) or Government Printing (GP) Schedule will be compensated at the appropriate journeyman or apprenticeship step for which he qualifies by an evaluation of his training and experience.

b. An individual promoted from a Graphic Arts (GA) or Government Printing (GP) position to a Classification Act Schedule or Wage Board Schedule (WB, WBS, LB) position shall receive the lowest rate of the grade of the position to which promoted which exceeds his existing rate of pay.

13. CHANGES TO LOWER GRADE - (CLASSIFICATION ACT SCHEDULE, WB, WBS, AND LB POSITIONS)

a. An individual who is changed from one position to another position of lower grade will be compensated at the highest rate in the lower grade which does not exceed his existing rate of compensation in the higher grade position falls between two steps in the lower grade, the higher of the two steps may be used whenever the change to lower grade action was taken for reasons other than disciplinary action or unsatisfactory performance.

b. An individual who is changed to lower grade as a result of the reclassification of his position without significant changes in the major duties assigned, may retain his existing rate of compensation so long as he continues to occupy the position involved. A change to another position will require pay determination action as in paragraph 13.a. above.

c. An individual whose existing rate exceeds the maximum scheduled rate of the lower grade by reason of longevity step-increases shall receive basic compensation fixed on an equivalent number of longevity step-increases in the lower grade.

d. When an employee is returned to a lower grade subsequent to temporary promotion to a higher grade, his pay will be fixed at the rate of the lower grade which is the equivalent of the rate to which he would have progressed by means of periodic step-increases had he occupied the lower grade throughout the period of temporary promotion.

e. When change to lower grade is effected as a disciplinary action, the individual's rate of pay may be set at any step within the grade which does not exceed his existing rate.

f. When change to lower grade is effected as a result of unsatisfactory performance, the individual's rate of pay will be established at the rate of the lower grade which is the equivalent of the rate to which he would have progressed had he occupied the lower grade throughout the period of time the higher grade position was held.

g. In change to lower grade actions, above, the "existing rate" to be creditable must have been held in the higher grade position for a period of at least 90 days.

14. CHANGE TO LOWER GRADE - (GRAPHIC ARTS (GA) AND GOVERNMENT PRINTING (GP) POSITIONS).

Changes to lower grade actions will be compensated in consideration only of the step of the journeyman or apprentice wage schedule for which the individual qualifies based on an evaluation of his experience and training.

15. REASSIGNMENTS

Reassignment actions are effected without change in pay rates, and only the last received pay rate will be considered except in cases of reassignment between WB, WBS, or LB positions located in different wage rate localities but of the same grade, the pay rate will be established on the basis of (1) that rate on the wage schedule for the new locality applicable to the numbered grade and step formerly held, or (2) the pay rate in dollars and cents last received. If the last earned rate falls between two steps of the grade concerned the selection will depend upon the discretionary factors used for wage determinations.

16. CONVERSIONS

a. An employee whose position is converted from the Classification Act Schedule to a Wage Administration Schedule (except GA and GS Schedule positions) shall be entitled upon conversion to compensation at a rate under the prevailing wage system which most nearly equals but is not less than his rate prior to the conversion. If no such rate exists in the wage administration position, he shall be paid at a rate equal to his rate prior to conversion.

b. The same procedure shall apply to conversion of an employee and his position from any Wage Administration Schedule to the Classification Act Schedule.

c. An employee whose position is converted from the WB-WBS Schedule to the LB Schedule or vice versa shall be entitled upon conversion to the rate which most nearly equals but is not less than his rate prior to the conversion. If no such rate exists, he shall be paid at a rate equal to his rate prior to conversion.

POSITION ANALYSIS SURVEYS

I. INTRODUCTION

As a frame of reference it seems desirable first to explain the difference in approach between the two personnel programs of Personnel Assignment and Position Evaluation. The former deals with the individual and the latter with the position. As a specialist concerned with job analysis and related matters such as organization and functions of a component, the position evaluation officer should posses a general knowledge of job patterns and job relationships. He should have a keen analytical ability as well as the ability to learn administrative and operating procedures quickly and deal effectively with others.

II. DEFINITION AND PURPOSE

Position Evaluation Division has been vested with the authority to conduct position evaluation surveys. These encompass blocks of jobs and bear some similarity to organization and management surveys. They may be done by organizational component or by occupational group. For example, all the positions in the Office of the Comptroller might be surveyed or else all Finance Officers in the Agency.

The primary reason for conducting a position analysis survey is to secure a current picture of jobs in operations -- to relate tables of organization to actual operations being performed. Organizations have a way of "drifting" from the original intent of the T/O. There are a number of advantages to be obtained from surveying a group of related position. Job patterns and relationships can be established more easily and quickly. It is also possible to secure greater coverage in shorter time because more positions can be audited and described when covered as a group than if each were considered individually at different times. A shorter length of time per position would also be required.

An employee desk audit for each position is seldom necessary. Where positions are identical or similar only a sampling need be audited. Information may be acquired from other sources such as supervisors or other key people. This is particularly true in establishing vertical and horizontal job relationships in establishing the flow of work in the component, or in picking up overlaps and duplications. It is time-consuming to gather this information bit by bit from each individual involved. The development of background information on each position, traveling to the site of the position, and meeting each incumbent and his supervisor also require time. Auditing techniques are discussed in another section of this manual, "Position Evaluation Audits."

III. PREPARATION FOR THE SURVEY

No matter who agrees to the survey -- at what echelon in the organization under survey -- a certain amount of selling is necessary to "middle" management, first-line supervisors and incumbents. The first official work usually goes down the line from the Assistant Director, Division or Staff Chief and/or the Administrative Officer. After that, Position Evaluation Division representatives hold meeting with supervisors and employees to explain the purpose of the survey and methods to be employed.

Planning the survey is the key to successful accomplishment. The first step is to define the objectives in terms of how many organizational components will be included, how many positions covered, and how many position descriptions prepared. Certain administrative considerations affect the planning, such as how long the survey will take and how many position evaluation officers can be assigned. Operational problems must be considered in answering these questions. Will personnel actions relating to the positions under survey be frozen? What short-cut techniques can be used? Is it feasible to use questionnaires, limited descriptions or limited audits (on a random sampling basis)?

After decisions are made on the above matters, individual position evaluation officers are assigned specific organizational components to be surveyed. In the orientation process, it is necessary to secure and study as much background data as possible before actually observing first hand the work being done. Among the data examined are current organizational and functional charts, which have to be prepared in PED if not readily available, current operating manuals, Agency and component regulatory material, and former position descriptions.

IV. CONDUCTING THE SURVEY

In "kicking off" the survey PED representatives meet with operating officials to establish the best time for conducting the survey and to make other arrangements. PED levies job information requirements, meets with the various operating components involved to acquaint supervisors and other employees with the requirements established, and then sets deadlines for the submission of the position description drafts. These may be in the form of completed questionnaires, narrative drafts or job outlines.

Upon receipt of this position data, the evaluation officer analyzes it. He determines next which desk or supervisory position audits are to be made and proceeds with them. After position data has been collected, he attempts to develop accurate position descriptions acceptable to operating officials resolving whatever duplications of functions and overlaps of responsibilities he can on an informal basis. Then he develops recommendations for consideration in PED.

V. PRESENTING SURVEY FINDINGS

Each survey member presents his recommemded evaluations to PED supervisors or, in the case of a large survey, the Survey Team Captain. They reach agreement and decide on any specific evaluation problems which remain to be discussed with the operating officials. Then PED representatives, generally supervisors or Team Captain, informally present general as well as specific problems yet to be resolved to operating components. Through discussion as many classification problems as possible are resolved during this informal survey wind-up.

The final step in presentation is a formal survey report covering the findings. This includes final drafts of position descriptions, summary of the status of the organization, position evaluation actions already taken as well as other personnel actions considered necessary. In this latter category would fall such actions as proposed downgradings, re-assignments or promotions. This report is submitted to the operating component.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF FINDINGS

The primary objective is to present findings as quickly as possible and secure appropriate action. After operating components have had an opportunity to review the survey findings, follow-up discussions are held to make final resolution of problem cases. The final steps are for PED to issue an adjusted T/O, if necessary, and for the operating office to initiate any personnel actions necessary to bring into effect the recommendations of the survey team.

POSITION EVALUATION AUDITS

This is intended to explain why positions are audited and how that audit is conducted. The audit technique is one that is generally used throughout government and industry to make available an accurate and current portrayal of jobs to be used in determining the proper pay rate for the individuals assigned to these jobs. In short, an audit is a process used by position evaluation officers in ascertaining exactly what duties and responsibilities as well as what supervisory controls are involved in a given job or position.

There are basically two types of audits conducted in Central Intelligency Agency -- namely, the employee desk audit and the supervisor audit. It might be well to interject at this time that frequently an employee desk audit is checked over by the employee's immediate supervisor in order that there be no conflict between supervisor and employee regarding the latter's duties.

In conducting a desk audit of an Agency employee, the position evaluation officer sets up a time that is convenient to himself, the employee's supervisor and the employee. Usually in accordance with current Agency regulations, he will have his possession, prior to conducting the desk audit, a "duties statement" covering the basic duties of the employee. This gives him a general understanding of the organizational location of the position as well as the basic duties that are inherent in the position. He will also find it to his advantage to study the organizational background of the position in terms of the mission, functions and to the extent possible in advance, the interrelationships of positions in the component. Practice has shown that having this prior information makes the process less painful for the person being audited as well as for the person auditing.

After arranging a mutually agreeable time, the evaluation officer is introduced to the incumbent by his supervisor who has usually explained why the audit is to be conducted. The evaluation officer then explains that he is interested only in finding out what the duties are in this particular position and, if pertinent, how the incumbent goes about accomplishing same. Usually he will work within or around the basic framework of the duties statement as furnished by the incumbent himself or his immediate supervisor. It is best, if possible, to elicit the more important duties in the position first, such as in the case of a secretary -- review and composition of correspondence, which would be of more importance than routine alphabetical filing.

In conducting an audit, the following criteria and/or questions are pertinent:

(1) What exactly is the work or activity that is performed by the incumbent?

(2) In what form does subject work come to the incumbent?

(3) What instructions are given?

(4) Are there rigid or non-rigid guidelines to follow in completing the work?

(5) What does the incumbent do in completing a given piece of work?

(6) Exactly what is this work when it is finished?

(7) Who reviews this work that is done by the incumbent?

(8) What are the nature and extent of review?

(9) What use is made of this work?

(10) What are the nature and purpose of personal contacts?

(11) What are the extent of commitment authority and the consequence of error?

One of the important things is to control the audit in such a way as to glean the pertinent facts concerning the position and to exclude such non-essentials as dusting desks and various minor details.

There are always certain extemporaneous duties involved in every clerical position, but these may usually be included by stating at the end of the duty sheet, "performs miscellaneous duties as assigned." Unless the evaluation officer is extremely familiar with the type of position he is auditing, the taking of clear, concise and workable notes is a mandatory requirement in conducting a satisfactory desk audit. Details of the position not immediately apparent should be delved into further to provide a basic concept of that particular duty. Job samples of the work will usually aid in increasing familiarity with that particular operation or activity.

One of the basic concepts in the general field of position evaluation is that theposition only is audited without primary concern for the individual who is currently occupying said position. In short, objectivity is essential to accurate position evaluation. Certain people tend to be more imaginative in expressing themselves, so extreme caution must be exercised at all times to confine descriptions to an expression of the true facts.

After the evaluation officer conducts the desk audit, he usually returns to his desk, reviews the notes and writes a clear, concise statement of the position as he saw it at the time of the audit. In writing a position description, he should avoid using words that have

nebulous meanings such as planning, programming, implementing, coordinating or preparing unless such words are clearly defined in the body of the description so as to leave no doubt in the mind of the reader as to their meaning. Whenever possible, paragraphs or sentences should start with action words or verbs, such as, types, answers, searches, files and records.

As the narrative develops, certain conflicts with other positions appear and certain statements seem dubious in light of the position evaluation officer's general knowledge of the organization. These should be checked out and agreement reached to the satisfaction of all concerned. The next step is to evaluate the position and advise the operating component. In evaluating a particular position, other comparable position descriptions should be investigated, and the relationship of this position to other positions within the component both above and below should be seriously considered.

There are certain times in this Agency when it is desirable or necessary to audit a position by discussion with the supervisor rather than the employee. This is especially true when new organizations are being set up or vacancies exist. In this instance, the supervisor, within the broad framework of his component function, should be allowed to describe a position, bearing in mind that any projection of duties must interrelate with the duties of the component's other positions.

We have just discussed, in brief, how position audits are conducted. While appearing relatively simple on the surface, they can frequently become most difficult for the person who is auditing as well as the one being audited. Arguing with the employee is never desirable, and any difficulties that cannot be solved by friendly dicusssion should be ironed out with the employee's immediate supervisor or referred to a supervising evaluation officer for resolution. In conducting audits of scientific and/or other types of jobs of which the evaluation officer has no technical knowledge, he must make more explicit notes and study the position carefully in order to obtain sifficient information to make an accurate evaluation of the position. In order to allocate positions properly, the audit technique must be mastered and used to the fullest degree possible.

THE POSITION DESCRIPTION

I. INTRODUCTION

This section is primarily concerned with the mechanics of writing and maintaining current position descriptions in terms of their use in position evaluation and the steps involved in obtaining official allocation. Regulation [redacted] -- Position Analysis requires that "all pertinent information and evaluation material developed through position analysis will be recorded in official position descriptions." Position descriptions are the means for documenting facts obtained through the use of position evaluation techniques and tools such as charts, manuals, questionnaires, factor analysis, audit and survey. The basis for salary and wage administration as applied to specific jobs consists of the relative difficulty of work and the degree of responsibility exercised in performing it. To appraise these factors properly and insure equity and adherence to principles of equal pay for equal work, job information is essential. So position descriptions provide a record of such information.

25X1A

II. DEFINITION

A position description is a written statement of a job assignment -- of the duties and responsibilities, organizational relationships, qualification requirements, and distinguishing features of a job. It is not, except by coincidence, a description of the work qualifications or distinguishing characteristics of a person, for jobs may exist and be described even though vacant. Further, a given job may be occupied by a succession of incumbents who vary in personal qualifications and, for a variety of reasons, may or may not fully perform the duties of the job in the manner described. For instance, the length of time they are in the job bears on their ability to fully perform all the duties of the job in the manner described. Of course, the incumbent generally provides an important medium for procuring job information.

III. ORIGIN OF JOB INFORMATION

The job is created by operating officials in whose component it is located. Information about the job is derived from a variety of sources -- chiefly within the organization where the job is located and, to some extent, from related files in the Position Evaluation Division. If there exists any written information, the extent to which data from the operating office is useful for writing up the position varies from case to case. This variation depends on such factors as the kind of job involved, the nature of the material, the author of it, his familiarity with position descriptions requirements, the urgency of the case and purpose for which it is submitted. Agency Regulation [redacted] required submission of position descriptions to support requests

25X1A

for grade structure changes, with proposals for new or revised T/O's, and in connection with surveys. There are times when this written data is not supplied, so the position evaluation officer must go after the information in order to make proper determinations. In any case, production of the official job sheet is his responsibility. The extent to which he uses what is written by operating personnel varies with the pertinency, quality and nature of material received.

IV. WHEN ARE DESCRIPTIONS WRITTEN?

Ideally position descriptions should be written whenever significant changes affecting series or grade occur. In practice job descriptions are usually written when operating officials indicate that a job has either been created or changed or when a T/O revision is requested. In effect, this means there is no end to the process of writing position description. Descriptions are an end product of the position evaluation surveys which are constantly in process, some in Agency areas where jobs have not previously been covered by official position descriptions. In areas which have been covered by position descriptions, organizational changes constantly occur which require new descriptions. When the Agency's goal of position descriptions covering all jobs is attained, there should be periodic re-surveys to insure the currency of existing descriptions.

V. HOW ARE DESCRIPTIONS WRITTEN?

There are instances where data submitted by operators is so well written and complete it can be used as an official position description simply by attaching a cover sheet identifying the position by number, title, code and organizational location; making minor, if any, revisions; and getting the product certified and allocated. In other instances position evaluation officer can write the elements lacking in the operator's contribution to provide a satisfactory position description. In either case, of course, he is responsible for checking with operating officials or other sources to insure the authenticity of information supplied. Generally, to insure adequate coverage of all pertinent elements of the job, to pin point those parts of the description in which the various users are most interested and to facilitate the reading and use of the description, a prescribed format is followed. There is, of course, no rigid pattern. Circumstances dictate how close the adherence to format must be.

A few years back when there were fewer classifiers in CIA and far fewer jobs had been documented, descriptions were usually written in brief narrative form on perhaps one sheet of paper largely consisting of statements of duties with attention to personal qualifications required and organizational location. Evaluation factors, such as scope and effect or mental demands, were sometimes indicated in passing with varying degrees of thoroughness, but with no attempt to segregate them from the remainder of the description. The classifier who wrote the sheet could often interpret the qualifications or the evaluation factors

and distinguishing features on the basis of his personal memories of other jobs, individuals or organizational structure closely related to the described job. Unfortunately, these aspects of the job were rarely, if at all, familiar to other classifiers or persons outside the classification component.

In formal survey situations wherein a given organizational component was thoroughly reviewed, in addition to narrative descriptions for all the positions covered, a detailed survey report was prepared. Whereas elements other than duties and responsibilities were utilized in evaluating job descriptions on an individual basis, they were not often written down; however, in the survey report which accompanied the descriptions, there were statements on the component's mission and organizational structure along with discussions of individual jobs in terms of qualification requirements, evaluation factors, distinguising features and, perhaps, comparisons with related jobs within or without the Agency.

VI. FORMAT

Position evaluation procedures are never static as to description format, which has been and is constantly under study to determine its usefulness. A continuing objective is to widen the range of customers in various Agency components who may use these descriptions to advantage. These procedures have been constantly subject to trial to determine their effectiveness.

A few years back it was determined that the position description could serve a variety of purposes more effectively by expanding it to include the type of job information formerly consolidated in survey reports. This applied to all position descriptions whether a part of a survey package or prepared on an individual job basis. Accordingly, a format with the nine headings shown below was adopted, and the survey report was correpondingly reduced largely to a historical account of survey activities and pertinent background data.

1. Duties and Responsibilities
2. Supervision Received
3. Minimum Qualification Requirements
4. Scope and Effect of Work
5. Mental Demands
6. Personal Work Contacts
7. Special Considerations
8. Position Progression
9. Distinguishing Features

With minor variations, this format was used for many months in writing position descriptions. In the course of trial and error the necessity for certain revisions became apparent. The relevancy of the long format items was not challenged, but more compelling factors dictated that the format be modified. Individual position descriptions under the nine-point format were quite long. Under the pressure of

position evaluation needs for covering large numbers of jobs in a short time, the format had to be altered. Accordingly, the format presently in use comprising four major headings was developed through an evolutionary process and series of changes. Below is a listing of these headings with instructions on their development into a description:

POSITION DESCRIPTION FORMAT

A. JOB SUMMARY:

Express in a concise statement a summary of the work performed and, where practicable, the function or mission of the organizational component in which the job is located so the reader may grasp immediately the general nature of the job and its place in the organization. For example, "Maintains pay, leave and retirement records for an assigned group of employees;" or "Serves as Chief of the Selection Section, responsible for selecting from bibliographis material currently received in the library by purchase, gift or official transmittal that which should be retained."

B. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Describe each major duty or function of the position in a separate numbered paragraph, listing the tasks and explaining what, how and for what purpose work is done. In many cases this may be accomplished by showing: (1) status of work when received by employee; (2) procedures and processes applied acction or plans initiated or developed, and conclusions and decisions reached; and (3) form of completed work, action taken on the basis of the work or use to which it is put. For positions having specific or area responsibility describe the responsibilities, delegations of authority, decisions made and effect of work. Describe liaison responsibility (if pertinent) as to level, frequency of contact, purpose and effect. Include, where applicable, information on regulatory material such as regulations, directives, memoranda or manuals which exert control over the work and the way in which control is effected. For positions having supervisory or managerial responsibility, give information on the following items wherever applicable: (1) types, numbers, and grade levels of employees supervised; (2) nature of instructions, guidance or other supervisory or managerial control exercised; and (3) nature and purpose of review given completed work -- technical, general, intermittent, close, etc.

C. SUPERVISION AND GUIDANCE RECEIVED:

Identify immediate supervisor and explain nature of supervision and guidance received. Details on the following are desirable: (1) specific instruction on policies, procedures, work precedents, etc.; (2) type and frequency of problem referred to supervisor; (3) availability of supervisor as in projects where some employees do not have direct access to the supervisor; (4) review of work in process or completed work by supervisors or others.

D. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS OR JOB REQUIREMENTS:

Include unusual security considerations; hazards or unusual working conditions; special qualifications requirements such as language or area knowledge not generally applicable to the job title and code.

E. This final element appears only on PED copies. It is a concise statement of the major reasons for the grade level recommended. It should state further the key characteristics which distinguish the position from a similar or related position at the next higher grade level below. Comparisons with other positions, especially of the same grade level within or without the Agency, may also be included. Operator's statements may be utilized under this topic, but it is primarily the position evaluation officer's analysis of factors bearing on the recommended allocation.

Although Minimum Qualification Requirements are still an important element, they are no longer spelled out in each individual position description. The majority of positions in the Agency are now covered by standards, either by [redacted] publications or Interim Qualification Standards issued by PED prior to publication in [redacted]

VII. CONCLUSION

This material covers the documentation of facts gained through the use of various position evaluation techniques and tools. More detail on the application of these techniques and tools is included in various other sections of this manual.

POSITION DESCRIPTION

1. POSITION NUMBER
Entered by CWD

2. CAREER SERVICE DESIGNATION	3. LANGUAGE CODE	4. AREA KNOWLEDGE CODE	5. DUTY STATION
	CWD Use	CWD Use	WASH., D.C. / OTHER (Specify)

6. REASON FOR SUBMISSION (E.G., CHANGE OF DUTIES, CLASSIFICATION SURVEY, ETC.) IDENTIFY OLD POSITIONS BY TITLE, SCHEDULE, OCCUPATIONAL CODE, GRADE, POSITION NO.
CWD Use

7. PLACEMENT DIVISION CONCURRENCE
DATE:

8. ACTION	POSITION TITLE	SCHEDULE	OCCUPATION CODE	GRADE	INITIALS	DATE
A.	Used in event of reallocation of a position by CWD or for allocation by AD/P or higher authority.					
B. CWD	CWD Allocation Determination					
C. INITIATING OFFICE	Operating Office Recommendation (Optional)					

9. ORGANIZATIONAL TITLE OF POSITION (IF ANY)
Operating Office Recommendation (Optional)

10. NAME OF EMPLOYEE (Last) (First) (Middle) IF VACANCY, SPECIFY
Optional

25X1A

11. ORGANIZATIONAL LOCATION OF POSITION
A. OFFICE
Organizational structure according
B. DIVISION OR STAFF
approved Table of Organization.
C. BRANCH
D. SECTION
E. UNIT

12. CERTIFICATION Reference: [redacted] Section 4.
This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of this position

	DATE
A. EMPLOYEE	
B. SUPERVISOR Reviewing Official (Operating Office)	
C. OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE Certifying Official designated by Head of Operating Office.	
D. CWD Certifying Official (Office of Personnel)	

13. DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS Reference: [redacted] Section 5.

25X1A

I. Duties and Responsibilities:
Describe each major duty (work assigned and performed) in a separate numbered paragraph, listing the tasks involved and indicating the approximate percentage of time spent on each major duty, whenever feasible. For each major duty, describe specifically what is done, how it is done and for what purpose. In many cases, this may be accomplished by covering the following points: (1) status of work when first received by the employee, (2) procedures followed, processes performed, action or plans initiated or developed, or decisions made in accomplishing the work, and (3) form of completed work, nature of review or approval required, action taken on the basis of the work, or use to which it is put. Explain briefly the responsibility of position for specific programs or segments of work.

If supervisory or managerial responsibility is present, include in major duty statements the following: (1) types and numbers of employees supervised and/or (2) nature of supervisory or managerial control exercised, indicating nature of technical guidance or instruction given; responsibility for administrative matters such as personnel, supplies, equipment, expenditures, etc.; and type of review performed of completed work, whether technical, general, intermittent, close, etc.

II. Supervision Received:
Identify immediate supervisor of the position and type and nature of supervision and guidance received in terms of: (1) oral or written instructions, procedures, regulations, and work precedents, (2) availability of supervisor for consultation and the type and frequency of problems referred to him, (3) nature of review of completed work or work in process by supervisors or others.

FORM NO.

III. Minimum Qualification R[illegible]irements:

Agency Position or Qualification Standards should be used as a guide in preparing this section. Reference: [redacted]

25X1A

1. Knowledges: Identify and indicate the scope and degree of knowledge requir[illegible] of subject matter (e.g., economics, transportation) or of a geographical ar[illegible] or language. List specialized "Agency" knowledge as a minimum requirement only if it is not possible to be acquired during the normal on-the-job orientation period.
2. Skills: State the degree of manual or clerical skills required, (e.g., dictation at 80 w.p.m., typing at 40 w.p.m., journeyman skill in linotype operation, expert skill in cartographic drafting.)
3. Abilities: Professional or managerial abilities such as research, writing, speaking, supervising, organizing, etc.
4. Work Experience and Education: Type, level, and amount (in years or fractions thereof) of prior work experience required, and the specific [illegible]ducation or training which may be substituted therefor, in whole or in part.
5. Personal Characteristics: Interests or aptitudes of special significance.
6. Special Qualifications: Unusual physical requirements, possession of veterans status, special security clearances, licenses, etc.

Note: Under items 1-6 above, desirable qualifications above the minimum may be included, but should be clearly distinguished as such.

Evaluation Data - Appendix to Position Description

(Developed jointly by Supervisor and Position Classifier. Items IV through VII are optional for clerical positions but should be included for executive, technical, and professional positions.)

Scope and Effect of Work:
Significance of work performed in terms of how the position fits into the organization, the authorities exercised, decisions made, and actions taken. State results of work and consequence of errors or omissions. Give information on size of program serviced in work units, budget, or personnel involved, if feasible.

V. Mental Demands:
Degree of mental demands in terms of (1) need to exercise original thinking, initiative or ingenuity, (2) standards of accuracy required, and (3) frequency of work under pressure to meet rigid deadlines, etc.

VI. Personal Work Contacts:
Types of persons or organizations (other than immediate superiors or subordinates) contacted. Reflect: (1) purpose and frequency of contacts; (2) how contact is made, e.g., personal visit, phone call, correspondence, group meetings, etc.; (3) special problems encountered in making such contacts; (4) authority to spea[illegible] for the organization.

VII. Special Considerations:
Other factors which affect significantly the difficulty of the work such as unusual security requirements, extra hazards, performance of prolonged travel, adverse working conditions, and the like.

VIII. Position Progression:
Lines of promotion or transfer, including lateral possibilities; (1) to the position; (2) from the position.

IX. Distinguishing Features:
The major reasons for grade level recommended. This concise evaluation should set forth the characteristics distinguishing the position from similar or relat[illegible] positions at the grade below and above it. Comparison with other positions at the grade recommended may also be made.

FIELD POSITION EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

I. ALLOCATION RESPONSIBILITY OF PED

The position evaluation responsibilities within the Agency are organized on a highly centralized basis. All classification action taken within the Agency for both headquarters and field positions is accomplished by the Position Evaluation Division, Office of Personnel, Headquarters. This means that any action recommended by field stations such as upgrading, downgrading, or establishment of a new position, must be processed through proper channels to the Position Evaluation Division. At the present time, no CIA field installation has any authority for the allocation of positions.

II. PROCEDURES IN ALLOCATING FIELD POSITIONS

A. T/O Review and Comparison

Generally, the field station submits requests for the establishment or re-allocation of positions to its headquarters component where the request is reviewed and may be revised. Changes at the headquarters level may involve organizational or grade structure revisions. From there, the request goes to Management Staff for review and approval of the organizational structure, functions, etc.; then to PED for review and approval of the title, series and grade structure of the positions.

Upon receipt of such requests, PED reviews the entire proposal on the basis of available information, a comparison with the current T/O, and a knowledge of the organization to determine the positions or organizational segments that are proposed for revision. Once the questionable positions have been segregated, PED representatives meet with officials of the headquarters component of the requesting station to discuss the entire T/O and obtain clarification of the duties and responsibilities of questionable positions. On the basis of these discussions, they usually reach agreements on the title, series, and grade of each position. In some cases, the requested grades are approved, subject to the receipt of specific job information; in others, the grades are cut to the level considered appropriate by PED, subject to further consideration upon submission of additional information concerning the specific duties and responsibilities of the position; in still other cases, the positions are established with dual (slash) grades (e.g., 9/11) pending receipt of additional information. Where these dual grades are established, no individual can be assigned or promoted to the higher level without a complete and detailed position description. These actions are flagged

in the PI room and any proposed promotion action or reassignment action to the higher level is forwarded to PED prior to final action.

B. Changes Initiated at Headquarters

In some cases requests to revise the grade levels of field T/O's are initiated at the headquarters level. In such instances the position evaluation officer meets with operating officials to discuss the proposal and usually requests that position descriptions be developed outlining the duties and responsibilities of the positions under consideration. These are prepared by the operating offices on the basis of their knowledge of the activities of the station and, in some cases, on the basis of information supplied by individuals returning from the particular area concerned. It is interesting to note that in some instances revisions of field T/O's are initiated by headquarters without prior coordination with the field establishment. Thus, upgradings, re-assignments, establishment of new positions and deletion of existing positions may be processed by headquarters, the field learning of such actions when advised of the change in T/O.

C. Evaluation of Position Descriptions Prepared by Headquarters

Many of the position descriptions PED requests in order to determine the allocation of specific field positions are developed in headquarters. Upon receipt of these descriptions in PED, the positions are compared with similar positions in other elements of the particular division or office concerned or in other divisions and offices of the Agency. In making such comparisons any peculiar circumstances or unusual duties involved in the position must be considered. On the basis of an analysis of these circumstances and duties it is possible to make a firm allocation of the position.

When position descriptions covering similar duties and responsibilities are not available, it is still possible to make comparisons with other positions at the level or the requested level of the position in question. Such comparisons are harder to make since relative difficulty must be determined. In comparing duties and responsibilities that are not alike, analytical ability and judgment in determining whether one duty is more difficult than another are extremely important. In this type of comparison the position evaluation officer should have a very thorouty understanding of the position in question.

D. Interview of Field Personnel Returning to Headquarters

In many instances where it is not feasible to get specific employee prepared position descriptions covering field positions, the position evaluation officer in cooperation with the operating office interviews individuals returning from the

field station with a general understanding of the work performed in the position in question. This information is then discussed with operating officials at the headquarters level to obtain their approval and comments. Once he receives this approval, the position evaluation officer must make necessary comparisons, analyze and evaluate the information and determine the proper allocation of the position. It is quite possible to allocate a position improperly on the basis of incumbent's information. On the other hand, in view of circumstances, there is no alternative but to base the decision on the available information.

E. Dispatch Requests to the Field for Information

When time permits, the position evaluation officer may request that necessary job information be obtained from the field station. Such requests are coordinated with the headquarters component officials who participate in determining the type of information to be requested. Generally, the request to the field should outline the specific information and amount of detail required concerning duties and responsibilities performed, supervision, scope and effect of work and any unusual conditions under which the duties must be performed. In addition, there should be a statement setting forth the supervisor's opinion of the qualifications requirements necessary to perform the duties. After receipt of this information and further discussions with operating personnel at the headquarters level, the position evaluation officer can determine the allocation of the position.

F. TDY Trips

One of the most satisfactory ways to obtain information on field-station positions is a TDY trip by the position evaluation officer concerned with the allocation of the positions found at the station. He can obtain first-hand information on the organization, functions and installations of the station as well as make desk audits of specific positions. Also, he gains overall information on the differences among the various field installations having approximately the same mission. Field trips of this nature assist both PED and the operating organization in the expeditious handling of T/O requests.

G. Problems Encountered in Above Procedures (Except TDY)

There are a number of factors connected with the administration of a field program which tend to contribute toward inadequate or inaccurate job information. The field stations receive no instructions or directives on a routine basis relative to position evaluation activities, the preparation of position descriptions and similar matters. Furthermore, with a few exceptions such as FE and EE Divisions, there are no individuals with position evaluation experience permanently assigned to the field and available to furnish guidance or advice.

The field organization is undergoing continuous change so that the position description is likely to be out of date before completion of its final draft. Also there is an abundance of misassignments or mis-slottings among the personnel so that the position to which an individual is assigned on the T/O doesn't necessarily reflect the duties he is acutally performing. Sensitivity of operations and the "need to know" concept also tend to restrict the amount of detail which is given out. Then even when sufficient information is obtained, there are a limited number of position descriptions available for comparison purposes, due not only to the nature of the operations involved, but also to the lack of complete current records and documentation.

III. DIFFERENCES IN OPERATIONS AMONG FIELD INSTALLATIONS

Generally there is a considerable difference in the activities performed in the various field organizations although these organizations are designed to fulfill similar responsibilities. Differences occur in:

A. Organization

Field stations may be organized on paper indicating similar activities for a group of employees, but personal inspection reveals that the duties actually performed differ for each employee. For example, in one station a Communications Technician (Radio) may be responsible for maintaining a stand-by station on frequencies to be used in case of emergency and in addition perform a considerable amount of maintenance, repair and installation of communications equipment. At some other station a Communications Technician (Radio) may maintain agent contacts and yet at still another station he may operate staff circuits. This difference is not reflected on the T/O and in many cases even headquarters personnel of the operating component are not fully aware of such situations.

B. Functions

The functions of each station vary to about the same extent as the duties of personnel described above. For example, one station is established as a stand-by station for communications support in time of hot war; another to insure adequate communications facilities to maintain contacts with agents in unfriendly countries; another to transmit propaganda programs to iron-curtain countries; and still another to maintain a staff communications network.

C. Isolation of Stations

In the allocation of field positions the location of the facility must be considered to take into account the supervision

and control exercised over it by the next higher echelon. In many instances, the field headquarters is relatively close to the facility and, therefore, readily available to render technical guidance and support in case of emergencies. In other instances the field station is located a considerable distance from the headquarters organization so that advice and assistance cannot be obtained within a short period of time. Sometimes the difference in cover of the headquarters and field stations make frequent contacts to obtain assistance to obtain assistance impossible. So some additional credit should be given to the individuals located at the remote stations who must make final decisions in case of emergency.

IV. PROCEDURES USED IN FIELD POSITION EVALUATION SURVEYS

A. Planning at Headquarters Level

Prior to the initiation of a survey of field installations, considerable planning must be done in headquarters. The area to be covered must be decided upon; the individual to conduct the survey selected; and a study made of available information on the area functions and positions to be surveyed. In studying available information the position evaluation officer must review the existing T/O in order to understand the size, grade structure, type of positions, functions, etc., of the station and the control exercised over that station by higher field organization or by headquarters. Once this is accomplished he must select the specific positions to be reviewed and estimate the time required to accomplish the survey for planning purposes.

B. Coordination with Headquarters Component

A further step in arranging for a field survey is coordination with the headquarters component of the organization to be surveyed. This involves discussions with operating officials on such matters as the purpose of the survey, area to be covered, time during which the survey is to be conducted and specific positions to be reviewed. The headquarters component may suggest certain changes in the proposed survey such as the deletion or addition of field stations or positions to be covered or revision of the time schedule. In addition the operating office may desire to have representatives accompany the position evaluation officer on the field trip.

C. Coordination with Management Staff

Generally in any proposed field trip it is advisable to inform the Management Staff of the DD/S on details of the proposed survey. Any possible management implications are discussed, and in some instances the Managemen Staff may also wish to have a representative participate in the survey.

D. Preparation of Itinerary

It is necessary to develop a complete itinerary of the proposed trip for approval by the Director of Personnel or his representative and use by the Central Processing Branch in making travel arrangements. This itinerary gives all pertinent details of the individual's schedule such as the approximate time of departure and return, type of travel, specific station or stations to be visited, and length of stay at each station.

E. Central Processing

The travel audits outlining the itinerary of the trip are submitted to the Central Processing Branch to use in arranging for necessary physical examination, immunization shots, passports and visas, purchase of transportation tickets, and arrangement for security briefings.

F. Advising Field Installations

Prior to the initiation of the field trip, it is important to advise each particular field area to be visited of the proposed trip. Instructions are usually forwarded concerning the positions to be reviewed and the necessity for preparing in rough draft position descriptions covering each of the positions. This gives the field installation an opportunity to review its positions and to have the basic material available when the position evaluation officer arrives at the station. This assists the evaluation officer in meeting the deadlines established for surveys of field positions. In addition, the field stations may consider any personnel problems that they are having and bring them to the attention of the position evaluation officer. Also, any classification problems in terms of proposed upgradings, reassignments, establishment of new positions or similar matters can be studied and necessary information made available to the survey team.

G. Discussions with Key Personnel of Field Stations

Upon arriving at the field installation, the position evaluation officer generally meets with the station or area chief or other key personnel to discuss the purpose of the survey and to establish procedures to be followed during the survey. This gives the field officials an opportunity to explain the organizational structure, functions performed, and any unresolved problems they have. They can arrange a "Cook's tour" of the installation so the survey team can obtain a picture of the various activities of the station in preparation for conducting individual desk audits.

H. Review of Position Evaluation Information

The next step in the survey is to study all available information prepared by the field employees concerning specific positions to be reviewed. On the basis of this information the survey team can develop questions to ask during the individual desk audits. Some of the employee prepared descriptions may be used as the official position description, but in most instances revisions or additions to the descriptions are necessary.

I. Desk Audits

Once the information is reviewed, the survey team conducts individual desk audits on certain positions under consideration. An audit involves personal discussions with the employee assigned to the position to obtain complete detail on the duties performed and information on supervision received and supervision exercised over other employees. In addition to these discussions with the incumbent, there are meetings with supervisory personnel to obtain any additional facts that should be considered.

J. Preparation of Preliminary Drafts

Upon completion of desk audits and discussions with supervisory personnel, the survey team, if time permits, prepares position descriptions in preliminary draft covering all positions reviewed. Generally these descriptions cover all the information obtained through audit and will be the major factor in the allocation of the positions. These drafts are then reviewed and discussed with the supervisory personnel to insure accuracy and completeness.

K. Review of Survey with Key Officials

Upon completion of the survey a final meeting is held with the key officials to discuss the accomplishments of the survey team, the problems encountered in the development of position descriptions, and the recommendations that will be made by the team upon return to headquarters. These recommendations may relate to allocation of positions, misassignment of personnel, organizational problems, or personnel factors such as morale and placement.

L. Preparation of Report

Upon his return to headquarters the position evaluation officer prepares a detailed report on the stations visited as to location and organization and a summary of the various positions audited or reviewed with a detailed position description on each one. The report also includes specific recommendations as to titles, series and grades of all positions and a statistical summary of proposed upgradings, downgradings, changes in titles and/or series and the number of position descriptions written.

M. Review within PED and the Office of Personnel

Officials in PED and elsewhere in the Office of Personnel review the field survey report in detail changing and modifying it as necessary. These changes may involve revisions to position descriptions and recommendations for the allocation of positions, but normally very little revision is made since the survey team is more familiar with the positions, functions and organization of the stations visited than the reviewing officials. The principal comments generally deal with the detail or lack of detail of the survey reports.

N. Report to Operating Components

Once the survey report and position descriptions have been approved within the Office of Personnel, the papers are forwarded to the operating element concerned for comment and approval. The major problems here generally center around the recommendations of the survey team on the grade levels of the positions. The operating office can submit comments to PED with recommendation for changes in duty statement, titles, series and grades. PED representatives then review these comments and generally discuss and clarify them with the operating officials. Usually they reach agreement on the allocation of positions, but whenever this is impossible the positions are usually shown on the T/O as dual or slash grades to indicate that the position has been questioned. The operating office must then submit justifications to PED on all positions listed as slash grades.

O. Processing Survey Results

After the operating components have approved the survey proposals, PED prepares T/O changes (Form 261's) authorizing the changes in T/O positions and formally allocates and distributes position descriptions. Thus, official records throughout the Agency are brought into conformance with approved survey recommendations and the survey is completed.

POSITION AND QUALIFICATION STANDARDS

I. PURPOSE OF POSITION AND QUALIFICATION STANDARDS

The basic purpose of position and qualification standards is to provide a system for the determination of grade levels, titles and occupational codes of positions and the qualifications required of prospective employees.

There are numerous other purposes. Standards facilitate recruitment and assignment processes. They give information to administrative and management officials which assists them in organizing and reorganizing, in delegating authority and responsibliity, in changing the flow of work and determining assignments of duties.

They furnish information to employees which will enable them to qualify for higher grades or for other lines of work in which they may be interested.

They aid in the establishment of standards of performance used for making fitness reports. They are useful to supervisors in determining the performance requirements, and to employees in reaching a better understanding of fitness reports.

A number of Agency standards have been developed and published

25X1A in [redacted]

II. NATURE OF POSITION STANDARDS

The first problem in the development of position standards is the determination of the nature or type of standards needed. These range from simple standard job descriptions to complex point evaluation systems. Numerous matters must be considered in making this determination. The nature of the organization, the number of positions, the qualifications of individuals who will use standards, the necessity for control, and the flexibility desired, are among the factors that must be determined.

The method of development of standards varies considerably with the type of standard. In the case of standard job descriptions, the problem is no more than the selection of representative job descriptions for all levels in a particular series. In the case of point evaluation standards, a detailed ranking and point assignment process must be carried out.

III. FACTORS

All standards use some form of factor breakdown. Factors may be no more than two or three such as: duties, supervision received, and supervision exercised, or they may include as many as twelve or thirteen factors. For practical purposes, five or six factors are

usually considered necessary. This number covers all essentially different aspects of work. A typical breakdown is as follows:

1. Duties (Including Supervision Exercised)
2. Commitments or Scope and Effect
3. Supervision Received
4. Mental Demands
5. Contacts

Qualification requirements is frequently shown as a factor, although, in normal practice, it is not used in determining the grade level of work.

IV. STANDARD JOB DESCRIPTIONS

For standard job description standards, descriptions of all positions to be covered are written either by classification personnel or by the employees, following the factor format. These descriptions are then ranked in order of difficulty and grouped by grade level. Then standard descriptions are developed which condense and bring out important points for particular levels. An introductory portion may be written to furnish background or organizational information. The standard may be published either in the form of individual descriptions or on a chart.

V. NAVY POINT EVALUATION PATTERN

A good example of a government point evaluation system is that used by the Navy Department. This standard uses seven basic factors each having a possible value of 100. In determining the point values for a particular standard, job descriptions are ranked in order of difficulty by each factor separately. When this is done, it has been the experience of the Navy Department that the exact degrees of each factor fall into particular ranges on the point scale. For example, in the case of Librarian positions, most positions fell into the following point values for Supervisory Control: 14, 22, 32, 40, 60 and 80. In most cases, positions seem to group together at a particular point value. Of 50 positions, 20 might fall at point value 22, 25 at point value 32, and 5 between 22 and 32. After positions are grouped in this manner, a written definition is developed for the particular point value. In cases where the range is too great, for example, when one value is 18 and the next 46 an interpolation definition may be written for a point value of 32 or 33. After the development of point ratings for all factors, a conversion table is developed which converts total points to grades. This point conversion table is based on the points assigned to the positions used in developing the standard. The completed standard must be validated by application to other jobs which were not covered in the standard. Changes are than made where necessary to correct obvious errors.

In the Navy evaluation pattern, all factors are considered to have equal weight. In this respect, the standard differs from other point evaluation systems including the Atomic Energy Commission standard.

VI. AEC FACTOR EVALUATION POINT SYSTEM

The AEC standard utilizes 6 factors, as follows:

1. Basic Skill
2. Contacts
3. Responsibility for Decisions
4. Supervision
5. Working Conditions
6. Effort

Each of these factors has a point range, as follows:

1. Basic Skill - 90 to 550
2. Contacts - 35 to 170
3. Responsibility for Decisions - 50 to 240
4. Supervision - 5 to 120
5. Working Conditions - 5 to 70
6. Effort - 5 to 50

In this system the most heavily weighted factor is Basic Skill. The second is Responsibility for Decisions.

In developing the standard a process somewhat similar to that used by the Navy Department was carried out. Job descriptions were ranked in order of difficulty by each factor separately, and a point value assigned within the range established. Definitions for various degrees of each factor were then developed. At this point, however, the methods diverged. Under the AEC system, the factors were weighted so that the ones considered most important in determining grades of positions would have the greatest effect. The conversion table was developed in a similar manner based on points assigned to the positions used in developing the standard.

In order to establish the exact meaning of degree definitions the AEC system utilizes benchmark descriptions for approximately 100 positions, the levels of which are clearly established. These benchmark descriptions are positions which fit in the middle range of points for the particular grade level. Wherever possible, benchmark jobs covered a broad range of point scores for individual factors. For example, under Basic Skills with a point range 90 to 550, the point range of benchmark positions varies from 95 to 530, in many cases, not more than 5 points apart.

In the application of the AEC standard, the individual who classifies the position determines approximate point range from the definitions, and then checks the benchmark descriptions and determines which fits the position in question.

VII. CLASSIFICATION -- POINT SYSTEM

This is a deviation from both the standard job description or factor system and the point system. Descriptive material for each factor is used as a basis for determining comparability for each factor. This comparison is then converted to a point score which, when added to scores of other factors, gives a total which converts to a grade level. The system does not provide for a degree range, but only a specific number of points where the definition is comparable to the responsibility of a particular position. In a sense, therefore, the leeway for subjective evaluation is reduced, although it is increased to some extent by the necessity for comparing levels of a position with the definition in the standard.

As an example of this, refer to [redacted] CIA Position Standard for Administrative Officer GS-0301.13, dated 11 September 1956. 25X1A

VIII. FACTOR EVALUATION SYSTEM

Factor evaluation standards are based on definitions of the various factors for each grade level. These may be published in narrative form or in the form of a chart. Charts are easier to use since comparison between the various grade levels can be made quickly.

IX. METHOD OF DEVELOPMENT

The initial procedure involves the determination of differences between factors at different grade levels. Information on positions at all grade levels, whether present in position descriptions or secured by audit of positions, discussions with employees, review of regulatory material, etc., is separated by grades and factors, and important differences in factors at different grade levels are isolated and become the framework upon which the standard is developed. Frequently, interpolations must be made to establish differences, even though the established levels do not provide exact comparisons. See
25X1A [redacted] CIA Position Standard for Finance Officer Series, GS-0510.14 and Budget Administration Series, GS-0560.00.

Written definitions are then developed to explain the exact requirements of the factors at each grade level.

This demonstrates use of Budget and Finance standard with examples of midpoint positions.

SAMPLE POSITION - Area Budget and Fiscal Officer

Suballotted Accounts	-	65
Allotment Accounts	-	85
Dollar Volume	-	$4,500,000
Field Stations	-	9
Certifying Authority		

Expanding area - additional money expected for new projects
Additional field stations - 2 or more will be established.

SAMPLE POSITION - Field Finance Officer

Total Transactions	-	$1,000,000
Total Allotment Accts	-	20
Total Employees	-	30
Total Agents	-	50

Finance Officer must procure currencies of several different countries in amounts running to $1,000,000 or more per year.

SAMPLE POSITION - Field Finance Officer

Total Transactions	-	$6,000,000
Total Allotment Accts	-	30
Total Employees	-	100
Total Agents	-	100

Certification authority. Cutback in funds expected.

ILLEGIB

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt